

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge has written a book on *The Last Supper* (Heffer; 2s. net). It is unexpected. It is not unwelcome. For in the story of the Last Supper, as related in the New Testament, there are points which are most surely appreciated by one who is a Hebrew scholar.

---

And it is just the story as it is related in the New Testament that Dr. R. H. KENNETT seeks to explain. He is much surprised that, 'in view of the great number and diversity of Biblical problems which stimulate research and are freely discussed at the present day, the institution of the Holy Communion, as it is recorded in the *New Testament*, is in general comparatively ignored.'

---

He may well be surprised. What is the explanation of it? The explanation is that those who take the words 'This is my body, this is my blood' literally are content to call it a mystery and stay there, while those who take them symbolically are unwilling to go further and examine the symbol, so far removed is it from their ordinary ways of thinking. But it is clear to Professor KENNETT, and 'cannot be too strongly insisted upon,' that what our Saviour said to His disciples on that memorable night was meant to be intelligible to them then and there. And it is to

search and see what that meaning was that he has set himself in this book.

---

He touches that word 'mystery' first. Is the Holy Communion a mystery? Not if it is Christian. The religion of the pagan world, at the time when Christianity was winning its way with the Romans, was a religion of mystery. And Professor Kirsopp Lake would have us believe that the New Testament was written within the atmosphere and under the incubus of the Greek and Oriental mystery religions. But Professor KENNETT knows better than that. 'In seeking an interpretation of the words of Christ, we must not go outside Jewish literature and Jewish custom, and, further, we must remember that we are considering an event which took place not when the influence of the "mystery" religions was at its height, but in the first half of the first century of the Christian era. Even if our Lord and His apostles had any acquaintance with the "mystery" religions of the time, these would have been to them so foreign that we may safely ignore them when inquiring into the meaning of the Institution of the Holy Communion in the Upper Room.'

---

The Christian religion is not a mystery. It is a revelation. Mystery in the sense of incomprehensibility 'there must be in every statement about God, for it is a mere truism to say that our finite



intellects cannot attain to the inscrutable things of God. Christ, however, came not to obscure, but to reveal the Father; and we have therefore no right to import into any of His utterances any mystery over and above that which is inherent therein by reason of the fact that it deals with the Divine. The words "This is My Body" are, and were intended to be, just as simple—and just as mysterious—as "Our Father which art in heaven": simple, for they were meant to be intelligible to simple people; mysterious, inasmuch as they refer to the Everlasting Son of the Father.'

Pass, then, to the night of the Supper. What night was it? Professor KENNETT is convinced that it was not the night of the Passover. It is important, in face of the controversy over the value of the Fourth Gospel for the facts of the life of Christ, that the Regius Professor of Hebrew, standing outside the controversy altogether, finds the Synoptists wrong here and the Fourth Evangelist right.

Moreover, it is this conviction, reached, we say, independently, that gives Professor KENNETT the key to the whole situation.

And first of all, it enables him to understand the words, recorded by St. Luke, 'With desire I desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer.' These words are usually taken to settle the controversy between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics. 'This passover'—clearly, it is said, they were at that moment engaged in celebrating the Passover. But that is to misunderstand the words and mistranslate them.

They are misunderstood and mistranslated in both our English Versions. Not only have the translators rendered the aorist ('I desired') as though it were a perfect ('I have desired'), but they have also 'failed to recognise the force of the un-Greek phrase "with desire I desired." It is evident that we have here an attempt to represent in Greek an idiom which is found in both Hebrew

and Aramaic, whereby, when it is desired to put emphasis upon a finite verb, the infinitive of the same verb is added to the finite tense. Whenever this idiom occurs in Hebrew or Aramaic it is always possible to represent the sense in English, without employing any adverb, merely by an emphatic pronunciation of the verb. Thus "With desire I desired" means simply "I *desired*." But as soon as the sentence is read with this emphasis its original meaning becomes clear. The emphasis on the word "desired" suggests that in the present case the desire is contrasted with its non-fulfilment; in other words, that the desire cannot be carried out. It was unnecessary for our Lord to add, "But what I desired will not be fulfilled"; for after the emphasis on "I desired," the non-fulfilment of the desire is naturally expressed by an *aposiopesis*. Accordingly our Lord goes on to develop the thought suggested by the words, "before I suffer"; "for I say unto you that I shall not eat it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God."

We come to the words of the institution. Dr. KENNETT discusses the different forms in which they appear in the different Gospels and in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. The discussion is not necessary for his purpose, and we may pass it by. The essential words, witnessed to by all the sources, are, 'This (the bread) is my body' and 'This (the wine) is my blood.' What is the meaning of them? What meaning could the assembled disciples of Christ have taken out of them?

They could not have understood them literally. Professor KENNETT is quite convinced of that. 'For apart from the difficulty of supposing that the Apostles could understand the bread to be literally the Body of Christ and the wine His Blood, when He stood before them whole in His human Body, His Flesh unwounded, and His Blood unshed, the Jewish horror of eating blood and of everything savouring of human sacrifice would have been sufficient in itself to exclude a literal interpretation.'



Nor could they have understood 'my body' in the sense of the Church. 'In St. Paul's teaching indeed the Church is the Body of Christ, and in 1 Co 10<sup>17</sup> he sees in the one bread of the Communion Service a type of the oneness of the Church. But the conception of the Church as a body having different members with different functions, which was not unnatural in the days of St. Paul, when the Church included many diverse elements, was scarcely natural before our Lord's passion, when the Christian Church did not exist. Moreover, if the Apostles had understood Jesus to mean "This bread symbolises the Church which is my Body," we should have expected that they would have recorded some other saying of Christ which would have prepared the way for such a conception; the Synoptic Gospels, however, have nothing to tell us about the unity of the Church, nor do they identify it with the Body of Christ.'

We come nearer the meaning when we take it that 'This is my body' is a way of saying, "'This symbolises My actual human Body, which, as the bread is broken, is to be broken on your behalf.'" But in this case we should have expected greater emphasis to be laid on the breaking, whereas the statement that our Lord after blessing broke the bread merely implies that He distributed the bread.'

Has Dr. KENNETT forgotten here that in 1 Co 11<sup>24</sup> we read, 'This is my body which is broken for you'? No, he has not forgotten. He knows that in the best text the word 'broken' does not occur. And although he is dissatisfied with 'This is my body which is for you,' which is neither Greek nor Aramaic, he does not think that we are entitled to help out the sentence by inserting 'broken,' as some early copyist did; all we can insert is some colourless word like 'given.'

What, then, do the phrases 'This is my body; and 'This is my blood' mean? They mean, says Professor KENNETT, that inasmuch as it was impossible for Christ to eat the Jewish passover with

His disciples, as once He earnestly desired to do, inasmuch as the Jewish authorities are to make that impossible, and He knows it, He has determined to make this supper a passover, a better passover than the Jewish Passover had ever been, and He is to offer *Himself* to His disciples as the Passover Lamb. They take the bread—let it be as if it were the unleavened bread of the Passover—nay, let it rather be as the flesh of the Passover lamb. They take the cup—let it be to them as the blood of the Passover lamb. And then—most momentous and most marvellous step—let their minds pass from the Passover lamb and rest upon Himself. Whatever the Passover would have been to them this Supper will be, and much more.

We have agreed—Professor KENNETT represents the Lord as in effect saying—'We have agreed that this bread shall represent to us the passover flesh, and this wine the passover blood—that is, if I am the true Passover Lamb, My Flesh and My Blood. Take, eat, therefore; this is My Body; drink ye all of this cup; this is My Blood. And as the passover in Egypt was the beginning of a new relation between the Lord and Israel, or, in Hebrew language, a "covenant," which was afterwards ratified by sacrificial blood, this wine will also be to you a symbol of that new and better relation with God which will be theirs who come with faith through the crisis of My death. I am indeed your Passover Lamb slain for you. Henceforth when you eat bread and drink wine, remember what I have said and done this night, and do it in remembrance of Me.'

Of the 'reversals of human judgment' which take place even in this life, it is probable that one will be the judgment which has been formed of the Samaritans. It is more a Jewish than a Gentile judgment. To the Gentiles, who read the New Testament, the Samaritans are represented most memorably by the 'Good Samaritan' of the parable—so memorably, indeed, that 'Samaritan'



has become a symbol for pity and help. But when even Christians turn their attention to the Samaritans of the Old Testament they acquiesce in the Jewish judgment. The Samaritans were a mongrel race, who spitefully tried to prevent the rebuilding of the temple because they were not permitted to take part in it.

The reversal of that judgment is most probable. It has been challenged in our day. The first to challenge it was an American scholar, Mr. J. A. MONTGOMERY. In a volume entitled *The Samaritans*, published in 1907, Mr. MONTGOMERY threw doubt upon the historical accuracy of the narratives which describe the Samaritans as a different race from the Jews, and said: 'When at last we come upon definite information concerning the Samaritans, of the kind that gives some description of them—and these authorities belong to the Christian era, the New Testament, Josephus, the Talmud—the Samaritans appear as nothing else than a Jewish sect. The one essential difference between them and Judaism is that their cult centres on Gerizim, not on Zion.'

A thorough investigation of the whole subject has now been made by a Cambridge scholar, Mr. Laurence E. BROWNE, M.A., Fellow of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, who has published a book on *Early Judaism* (Cambridge University Press; 14s. net). He supports Mr. MONTGOMERY, and goes further. He finds for himself that the Samaritans were not a mixed people, who worshipped sometimes the God of Israel and sometimes the gods of the heathen, and sometimes both together. More than that, and more surprising than that, he finds that their worship was purer than the worship of Israel had been before the Exile, for they had given up the use of the golden calf.

Mr. BROWNE's conclusion is that the rejection by the returned Jews of the Samaritans' offer to co-operate in the building of the temple was due to the fact that they would not look upon

Jerusalem as the only place where men ought to worship. They had their own place of worship on Mount Gerizim. As the woman of Samaria put it: 'Our fathers worshipped in this mountain.' The returned Jews showed their religious inferiority to the Samaritans by insisting on worship being possible in one place only. And they showed their moral inferiority by blackening for history the character of those who had so generously offered to assist them in the day of their distress.

Is this 'reversal' only another attack upon the Jews? It does not seem so. Mr. BROWNE's book is examined in the *Jewish Guardian* by Dr. Claude MONTEFIORE. The book, says Dr. MONTEFIORE, 'is written by a true scholar.' It has 'many aspects of interest, and is of considerable value.' 'Students will find in it an excellent account of the events which happened in Judæa after the "return" from the Babylonian captivity, and more especially of the years 520 to 400 B.C.' And then: 'Our author believes (as, indeed, seems most probable) that the Samaritans were far more Israelite by race, and far more simply and purely "a Jewish sect," than is usually supposed to be the case.'

Now that unexpectedly favourable verdict is an encouragement. It is an encouragement to take Mr. BROWNE seriously when he makes a much more startling proposal than the reversal of our judgment on the Samaritans.

There is in the Book of Isaiah a prophecy which stands by itself and hitherto has been the despair of the commentator. It is the prophecy which begins at 63<sup>7</sup> and ends at 64<sup>12</sup>. The most baffling verse is 63<sup>16</sup>: 'For thou art our father, though Abraham knoweth us not, and Israel doth not acknowledge us: thou, O LORD, art our father; our redeemer from everlasting is thy name.'

As we read the verse in the Revised Version (just quoted), there is little difficulty in it. 'Know'



and 'acknowledge' must mean 'help' or 'succour,' and all that the prophet means is that the patriarchs, being dead, can no longer help their descendants, but the Lord, who lives, is their true father, and can bring them succour at all times. But there is no justification for taking 'know' and 'acknowledge' in the sense of 'help' or 'succour.' More than that, the Hebrew word translated 'though' cannot be so translated. It can only be translated 'for.' And the whole interpretation falls with that. This is Mr. BROWNE'S translation: 'For thou art our Father, for Abraham knoweth us not, and Israel doth not acknowledge us; thou, O Yahweh, art our Father; our Redeemer from everlasting is thy name.'

But this verse is not the only difficulty. Almost as puzzling is the phrase in 64<sup>10</sup>, 'thy holy cities.' No one has been able to explain that phrase. Cheyne says: 'The phrase is remarkable; elsewhere Jerusalem is "the holy city."' Then again, it is unusual, it is even unique, to find this prophet throwing the blame on Yahweh for the misdeeds of the people. What other prophet dares to say: 'O Yahweh, why dost thou make us to err from thy ways?' And once more—and perhaps the most obviously perplexing passage of all—there is that incomprehensible verse, 63<sup>19</sup>. The translation of the Authorized Version is: 'We are *thine*: thou never barest rule over them; they were not called by thy name.' The Revised Version is: 'We are become as they over whom thou never barest rule; as they that were not called by thy name.' That is to say, the Authorized Version adds the word 'thine,' and the Revised Version twice adds the word 'as'; and the meaning provided depends in each case upon these added words.

What are we to do with a prophecy like that? Says Mr. BROWNE: Give it to the Samaritans. It fits them; it fits none other. Give it to a great unnamed prophet. There is more than one unnamed prophet in this book already. Admit another, but let him be, not a Jewish, but a Samaritan, prophet.

The Samaritans had made their offer to the Jews, and were rejected. It seemed 'that they, the "Ten Tribes," were being driven away from the inheritance of Yahweh and caused to forsake Yahweh. "O Yahweh, why dost Thou make us to err from Thy ways, and hardenest our heart from fearing Thee? Return for the sake of Thy servants, for the sake of the tribes of Thine inheritance." Cheyne's comment is: "It is as if the Jews would throw the responsibility of their errors upon Jehovah; and this in spite of the encouraging invitations contained in this very book. They speak as if it is not they who need to return to Jehovah (lv. 7), but Jehovah who is reluctant to return to them; as if, instead of 'feeding his flock like a shepherd' (xl. 11), he has driven it out of the safe fold into the 'howling wilderness.'" How accurately, though unintentionally, does Cheyne's description fit the case of the poor cast-out Samaritans!

The Venerable R. H. CHARLES, M.A., D.Litt., D.D., F.B.A., Archdeacon of Westminster, having finished his commentary on the Apocalypse, has turned his attention to the subject of divorce. What connexion has divorce with the Apocalypse? He does not say that it has any connexion. But his mind was free and divorce is a living problem. Then he hit accidentally—he says it was accidentally—on a passage in the Talmud, and he saw his way through the whole bitter controversy.

He believes that he has settled the controversy about divorce. Those who read his book, and it is easily read, will agree. In his usual way Dr. CHARLES leaves nothing to be done by another. He overdoes the doing indeed, several times repeating what he has already said. But that is the pardonable sin. Within quite a small book after all—*The Teaching of the New Testament on Divorce* (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net)—he has solved the Scripture difficulty, and, as we have already said, laid the controversy at last to rest.



There are four passages in the Gospels to be dealt with, two in St. Matthew (5<sup>32</sup> and 19<sup>3-9</sup>), one in St. Mark (10<sup>2-12</sup>), and one in St. Luke (16<sup>18</sup>). To understand these passages, we must understand the passages that they are based upon. These are Dt 22<sup>22</sup> and 24<sup>1, 2</sup>. In Dt 22<sup>22</sup> death is prescribed as the punishment of the adulterous woman and her paramour. That law remained in force throughout our Lord's ministry and for one or more years after its close. It was then abolished, probably owing to the pressure of the Roman authorities.

That that law was in force during our Lord's ministry is evident from the story of the woman taken in adultery which is found in the Fourth Gospel. It does not belong to the Fourth Gospel, but that it is a genuine piece of history and the record of a real incident in the life of our Lord no great scholar or critic, says Dr. CHARLES, entertains any doubt. Very well, if the woman was put to death, that was the end of the matter as far as she was concerned. No divorce was necessary.

But if the woman was not put to death—if the Deuteronomic law was felt to be too severe and was evaded, as no doubt often occurred, and as actually occurred in the case given in the Fourth Gospel—what then? Certainly then the husband could divorce her. After 30 A.D., when the death penalty was abolished, he was even bound to divorce her. He was allowed no other option. How is it, then, that the Pharisees came to Jesus, tempting Him, and asked Him if it was lawful for a man to put away his wife?

Turn to the other passage in Deuteronomy. The passage (Dt 24<sup>1, 2</sup>) runs as follows: 'When a man taketh a wife and marieth her, then it shall be, if she find no favour in his eyes because he hath found some unseemly thing in her, that he shall write her a bill of divorcement and give it into her hand and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his house she may go and be another man's wife.'

That passage 'gave the Jew the right to divorce his wife on the ground that he had found in her "some unseemly thing." Now, that this unseemly thing did not mean adultery is clear from the fact that the adulterous wife and her paramour were to be put to death, whereas the wife in this case is only divorced, and set free to marry another man. The meaning of the phrase "unseemly thing" is obscure. It seems to have involved something indecent, but certainly something short of adultery. Of the confessedly obscure character of the phrase the Jews took full advantage, and held themselves justified in divorcing their wives on the slightest pretext. The hopelessly lax interpretation of this verse, and the scandals that followed inevitably thereon, led, shortly before the Christian era, to a controversy that lasted for full a hundred years within the Jewish Church. This controversy was raging during the public ministry of our Lord, and the question put to Him by the Pharisees regarding divorce was the burning question of the day.'

Accordingly, when the Pharisees came to Jesus, tempting Him, they did not ask Him if a man could divorce his wife for adultery. They knew that. They were all agreed upon that. What they asked was whether he could divorce her 'for every cause.' The phrase was the accepted one in the controversy between the schools of Hillel and Shammai. It referred to the 'unseemly thing' of Deuteronomy, to which the Hillelites gave a wide interpretation, while the Shammaites tried to stem the degradation of marriage due to that interpretation by insisting on the unseemly thing being something serious. In short, the Pharisees came to Jesus in the hope that He would make an enemy of the one school by deciding in favour of the other.

What was His answer? His answer was that since God in the beginning made man male and female, in marriage they became one flesh; it was therefore unlawful for a man to divorce his wife for every cause. As for adultery, adultery was itself divorce, and the legal proceedings should follow as



of course. But that was not the question which He was asked. And that was not the question which He answered.

How then do we read in St. Mark's Gospel that the Pharisees simply asked Him, 'Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?' It is quite possible that the Pharisees put it that way. But if they did they could only mean 'put her away for every cause.' For there was no dispute or doubt about a man's right to divorce his wife for adultery. It may be that St. Mark gives the question in an abbreviated form; it is much more probable that he gives it in the form in which it was actually asked, for the Pharisees would take it for granted that Jesus understood. It is also probable that St. Matthew added 'for every cause' to prevent his Gentile readers from misunderstanding.

Since therefore—this is Archdeacon CHARLES'S conclusion—'since, therefore, our Lord's state-

ments on divorce condemned only those who put away their wives on inadequate grounds, and since these statements explicitly in Matthew and implicitly in Mark admit the right of divorce on the ground of adultery, it follows that there is no justification whatever in Christ's teaching for the attitude assumed by a large body of ecclesiastics who, at the present day, deny the right of divorce in the case of adultery, and the right of subsequent remarriage to the guiltless person, and, in the case of such remarriage, refuse such persons Communion—in other words, excommunicate them. Of these ecclesiastics, who lord it so mercilessly over the heritage committed to them, we may say, with the Old Testament prophet that by their misrepresentations, unconscious for the most part, "they have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom God hath not made sad," and that, like their forerunners in the New Testament, they are making void the teaching of Christ by their traditions.'

## The Minister's Message for To-day as inspired by the New Testament.

BY THE REVEREND H. R. MACKINTOSH, D.PHIL., D.D., PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY,  
NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

IN the last resort, the New Testament message for to-day is just the message for yesterday and for to-morrow. We heard more than enough, probably, three years since about everything being different after the war. Without paradox or perversity, it may be argued that everything rather is the same. The war has not changed the nature of God or the moral law; it has not created sin; and the longing for immortality which it released into thrilling expression had been there, latently, all the time. We are not discovering man's need or God's gospel, but only returning to them. And yet out of that infinite reality which we call the Gospel, each generation, each period of crisis, inevitably makes its own selection. Out of the great organ note of redeeming Love, the present-day Christian ear is catching certain undertones

and overtones—lifting them into prominence, valuing them afresh. All I can hope to do now is to mention one or two of these in the belief that they have a special timeliness, a palpable suitability to our position. The only general remark that need be made is that the New Testament is, at bottom, the most hopeful book ever written; so that the man who preaches pessimism to-day, or disseminates it by his talk, is badly out of line with the Apostles.

This, too, may be added—that if a message is to help men, it must be capable of being described as doctrinal. 'No preaching,' said Phillips Brooks, a fairly good judge, 'ever had any strong power that was not the preaching of doctrine.' What we are discussing is *a message*—not hints, or rumours, or even aspiring ideals, but great affirmations that



proclaim what God has done and what therefore we can trust and live by.

### I.

The groundwork of the message is this—that *something has happened*, something great, unprecedented, Divine, something which people mean when they utter the name 'Jesus.' Right through the Gospels and Epistles you can follow the bright track of that persuasion. Their uppermost feeling was that now that Jesus had been here, the world could never again be as it had been before. Jesus Himself felt that, and said so. He knew that in Him God had visited and redeemed His people. Hence a new age, a happier and better era, had now begun. 'Blessed are your eyes, for they see; and your ears, for they hear,' He said: they see and hear things which prophets and saints had longed for, and had missed. The Kingdom of God was upon them, and now men were called to enter, and were entering. St. Paul and St. John repeat this certainty. 'God sent forth His Son'; 'old things are passed away'; 'we know that the Son of God is come, and has given us a knowledge of Him that is true.' Supernatural redemptive powers, they feel, are out in search of man. Jesus, mighty to save, had not been there before, and He was there now.

What is it that gives the Roman Church its steady power over millions? I remember meeting Dr. Denney in 1912, and he said, 'I've just got back from Berlin. In church after church I found fifty or a hundred people, then I crossed the street to Roman Catholic churches and found them full—full of men.' How do you explain that? For myself I have not the least doubt that the reason, in large part, is this, that under all accretions of superstition and of distaste for truth the Roman Church has stuck to the purely religious conviction that here in this world there is to be had such a thing as Divine salvation, a supernatural Redeemer who can heal and feed the soul. Whatever may be said of its theology, in its worship and preaching it has not dissolved Christ in general principles. And if our line is to go down far enough, if it is to touch the fingers of captives sunk and manacled in the prison-house of sheer unrelenting fate and raise them to breathe God's air beneath His sky, we must proclaim the miraculous gospel. We must tell people that things happened in Christ,

and through Him are happening still, which nothing but God's boundless power can account for. Every mission worker is familiar with these things. But they occur elsewhere too. During the war I called on a delicate woman, all of whose three boys had been swept away in a few weeks, and as we parted on the door-step her last words were, 'The Lord is very kind.' That is supernatural religion.

### II.

Another element in the message is the Fatherhood of God with the Cross at its heart. Protestant Christendom is running no greater risk at the moment than an amiable conception of the Fatherhood. Opinions may differ as to the cause of this. Possibly it is the aftermath of queer non-Christian views of God that circulated during the war, or it may be that modern love of comfort has corrupted even the loftiest Christian idea and we like to have everything pleasant about us, even our conceptions of God. Anyhow, one feels now and then that very little would send us back to the genial, sedate, uninspired Rationalism of the eighteenth century, for which Christianity was an 'agreed measure.' But the Fatherhood disclosed in the New Testament is Fatherhood with Calvary as its token. 'God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself,' 'God so loved the world that He gave His Son'—we all know the texts and have all wondered over their sheer irreducible minimum of meaning, as they put vicarious suffering for the guilty right in the centre of God's life. That is the New Testament message at its height. What we are shown in the Gospels is not merely Jesus as a sublime or impressive person: always and everywhere He is engaged in a work, He is doing something, He is travelling on to death for men. So too in the Epistles, what we find is not just any kind of faith, the attitude of people more or less persuaded, rather inclined to think God is good; on the contrary, it is a passionate response to the redemptive passion of God in Christ, and a deep devotion set on fire by that. The first point in Christian religion, if the New Testament is any guide, is not to do something for Jesus Christ, but to let Him do something for us. That is how He put it. 'The Son of man came not to be ministered to, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom.'

Before 1914 some of us were growing shy of talking in sermons about the redeeming sacrifice



of Christ. It seemed a primitive, uncouth kind of phrase, out of keeping somehow with the predominating desire to have everything in religion quite ethical. We were in search of a better terminology. Then all at once a curious thing happened. The army went out, and instantly the very phrases which had sounded outworn and antiquated leapt to our tongue when we spoke of the soldiers and what they were enduring for us. It was the simplest, the most natural thing in the world to talk of *their sacrifice*. As one conservative writer put it, and he was no jingo: 'We live because they die, we are redeemed by their precious blood.' It was an irrepressible instinct. Yes, and that instinct goes still deeper in religion; it has power over our thought of God more profoundly even than over our thoughts of man. It is in the New Testament, and it must be in our preaching. God forbid I should say that no genuine faith can be awakened by any other sort of preaching; yet there are degrees of truth and adequacy, and if we are to stir in our contemporaries the gratitude and penitence which have upon them most distinctively the elemental Christian mark, and are richest in Christian impulse, we must declare such a Fatherhood as men only perceive as they stand, or kneel, there before the Cross. St. Paul said to the Corinthians that he resolved to know nothing among them but Jesus Christ—and there we have followed him as we could. But he went on—'and Him crucified'; and for an age which has had its notions of sacrificial love tragically deepened, the secret is in these three words. The Son is the Father's living portrait, and both Son and Father are best understood in the death for sinners.

Quaerens me sedisti lassus;  
Redemisti crucem passus;  
Tantus labor non sit cassus.

But the Father in whom Jesus believed was Power equally with Love. That is why on reflection we can see that certain current ideas regarding 'a finite God,' while they may seem to prompt moving and energetic preaching, become, if they are taken seriously and no longer as didactic hyperboles, the most self-defeating of mistakes. To think of God the Father as very much like ourselves, in difficulties, at least half ignorant of the future, a baffled struggler for whom the upshot of the struggle is most precariously uncertain, is to

make God, as a major observed to his padre, 'a rather pitiful being.' In His presence commiseration might easily become a temper more fitting than worship. There is nothing an easy-going world needs more to get back into its religious attitude than *awe*; but the representations of the Father I have just alluded to will scarcely help us there. When will men learn that they *must* not try to be wiser than the greatest Bible thoughts, and that Jesus knew best? Could we give men a bigger faith by preaching a smaller God?

### III.

The message must also speak of the power of the Spirit. Two incidents recur to me at this point. Some years ago I was talking to a busy doctor who was a religious man, when he said with a kind of abrupt vehemence: 'If I were a minister, do you know what I'd preach? The Holy Spirit.' Later, a noted philosopher remarked to me: 'I hear people preach all kinds of things, only not the Spirit; yet there's more need for that than for anything else.' This may sound extreme; in a sense it is so, for of course the man who is preaching about Christ in the heart, as a power energizing in the will, may really be preaching the Spirit without ever using the word. Yet cannot we understand what is meant when we recollect our own experience, as we wait in the vestry, just before going into the pulpit? There can hardly be a sincere man who, as he stood and prayed there, has not felt an overwhelming thirst for the Spirit's presence. The burden is more than he can bear: he has to persuade men to be reconciled to God, or to forgive injuries, and even the desire to do these things he knows perfectly well he cannot propel into people's minds. Nothing will happen except as Divine power enters his words, and gives them momentum. He not merely feels this; he feels that the Spirit's enabling power is literally there for him to take.

Now we invariably preach with greater effect truths which we have discovered in our private life. Here is the thought of unseen power available for weak men in the Holy Spirit. It is a central fibre in the message of the New Testament, and never was it more required than at the present hour. In the first century we can see the opening of the springs. 'Ye shall receive power' is the promise, and the echo of testimony is 'I can do all things.'



There was a Divine overcoming energy; these apostolic men were in contact with it, and an exuberance of life resulted.

How often as we preach it comes home to us that what people most need is not additional ideas, but elastic power and mounting life! Probably the worst know more than the best are practising. It has to be proclaimed that the triumphant powers of the Spirit are all about them, ready to flood in by the opened channel. There are men in our congregations struggling with evil habit who are weak only because they believe they are weak; there are women languid with neurasthenia and needless mental fatigue and depression; and to such people, and countless others, it is very life from the dead to be assured that they may possess this ample energy of the Spirit. To receive it will cleanse leprous souls, giving them back self-control, for no degrading habit can be named from which immediate and permanent victory cannot be had by one who will lay hold upon the present might of a loving God. To receive it will impart to the nervous and dejected 'that harmony and peace of mind and confidence of soul which is needed to bring health and power.' In the same higher dynamic lies the cure for the comparative impotence of the Church—that is, of ourselves. As in New Testament days, the possession of a Spirit-filled life, always, means glad fearlessness—the most infectious emotion in the world.

#### IV.

Finally, we must declare the revolutionary character of the gospel. And this needs not so much to be published in special addresses as to form the steadfast background of all we say. The God who touches and saves men in Jesus Christ is not

'the God of things as they are,' but the God who sits upon the throne and says, 'Behold, I make all things new.' New primarily in the individual—granted, but how far can that be carried except as things are new also in society? The drunkard may be converted, but what about his children so long as the public-houses are there to breed young drunkards? The poor slut may by the gospel's power become a thrifty and careful mother, yet her family may perish in the insanitary slum or be corrupted by insufficient house-room. We can never be satisfied, as Christians or preachers, with a social order that produces moral wrecks or poisonously embitters human minds faster than they can be cured. It is our business, accordingly, to see that on this subject the whole body of Church people gets a thoroughly bad and restless conscience.

In the New Testament we are confronted, above all, with Christ; and of Christ it has been pointedly observed the other day that 'if half that is said of Bolshevism is true, He would not have been a Bolshevik; but He was a revolutionary.' He wanted change, and He died to bring it about. What He had to say to men was not just what had been said 'of old time,' but something very different. His message of the Kingdom of God, with righteousness as the substance of its life and order, included the corporate regeneration of society. Hence it will not do for us, who have drunk in His words of life, to sit back timidly or comfortably and say concerning the social order as it is, 'Well, it will last our time.' We have to present Christ's gospel to our fellow-men as containing the only adequate motive and ideal for the continuous reforming work, prompted by the Holy Spirit, of promoting the search for new truth, the brotherhood of men, and the eager fulfilment of the Divine Father's interest in others.

---

## Literature.

### *NILE AND JORDAN.*

It is very easy for a man to throw away the right and title that he has to authority by simply under-rating himself. The Rev. G. A. Frank Knight, M.A., F.R.S.E., has written a book on the archæological and historical inter-relations between Egypt

and Canaan, and in the preface he says: 'The object of this book is to trace the various links which united these two contiguous territories, from the earliest times till the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. It is a long story, covering at least seven millenniums, and crowded with detail. The mere collecting of the facts, scattered over more than



1700 volumes and journals, has entailed many years of research, in the scanty leisure available to one with constant professional duties as a minister in a city charge.' Now that last sentence was sure to be seized by the busy reviewer and made the excuse for simply smelling the paper-knife. How *could* the minister of a city charge write authoritatively on such a subject? He could not, and therefore he has not done it, and the book is passed in a paragraph.

But this book *is* authoritative. One reviewer has read it and tested it. He has gone to the trouble of verifying not a few of the enormous number of references to literature in it. The range of the reading is appalling. But it is just the busy man who can do more business and does it well. This is a great subject and this is a great book on it.

The first thing to say about it has been said. It is authoritative. The whole subject has been studied scientifically; every fact has been substantiated by the available evidence; and the degree of certainty has been conscientiously recorded.

The next thing to be said is that as a true historian and scientific observer, Mr. Knight has called upon his imagination freely. The greatest scientists use the imagination first; then the verification follows. The historian must always do so. He must conceive the situation, and then see if the facts fit it. But he must be careful to have so open a mind always that when the facts do not fit he can change the conception. Facts gathered, however laboriously, and however carefully sifted and selected, are valueless for the apprehension of truth and valueless for its declaration, until they are made spirit and life by the imagination.

And the third thing is, that Mr. Knight has the indispensable gift of style. Take at random (for the sense of style is never absent) this description of Thebes: 'The wealth, glory, and magnificence of Thebes in the lifetime of the most splendid of her kings must have been overwhelming. The fabulous riches obtained by the long wars of conquest waged by his fathers, by the tribute from the vanquished territories, by the exceedingly profitable commercial enterprises in which his fleets participated, and by the customs duties levied on all trading ships which converged on Egypt from every part of the Mediterranean, were spent with a prodigal hand on the embellishment

of his royal capital. Visitors to the Court of Amenhotep III were dazzled with the grandeur of all they saw. The King's own palace was a gorgeous structure. His vast establishment of wives, concubines, officers, servants, Court officials, and retainers numbered many thousands. His table was laden with plate of the most exquisite design in gold and silver, with crystal goblets, glass vases, and rare porcelain vessels. His sideboards exhibited lovely bronzes worked in the most artistic fashion from the Mykenæan colonies in the Ægean. His walls were hung with priceless tapestries; his armouries were filled with the finest weapons which Phœnician art and Damascene skill could produce: the furniture of the palace was of precious aromatic wood from the East, while the richest embroidered goods, the costliest spices, and the most delicate Oriental articles of vertu made the halls of his Theban home a gorgeous exhibition of the extraordinary refinement and luxury of the age.

'Each of the nobles in his entourage had his superb villa, his gay summer chateau, his gardens blazing with brilliant parterres of flowers. The King's gifts to his friends were on a royal scale of generosity, and evidenced the immensity of his financial resources. Each New Year's Day the Pharaoh dispersed abroad chariots of gold and silver, statues of ivory and ebony, necklaces of every costly stone, splendid battle weapons, ivory whips, sunshades, carved chairs, and so on. The impression upon the mind of every new arrival at the Imperial City must have been overpowering. His eyes would behold the miles of imposing sphinxes that lined the roads, the forests of tapering obelisks, all carved out of single blocks of stone: the immense temples on both sides of the Nile: the stately quays on which the royal fleets disembarked the rich bales of goods from every quarter of the then known world: the gigantic statues of the Pharaoh towering into the blue sky like white mountains of stone: the dazzling brilliance of the State pageants when Amenhotep and his wife sailed in the Royal Golden Barge on the huge artificial lake: the blaze of colour when every ship, and galley, and boat in the river was aflame with parti-coloured bunting: the stateliness of the priestly processions: the sacred choir of Amen sonorously chanting hymns to the Sun-god assisted by the overpowering resonance of the music poured forth by the Royal Court Orchestra.



Never did Egypt display such imposing worldly glory: never were seen such luxury, such prodigality of treasure, such pomp and splendour as in the reign of Amenhotep III the Magnificent.'

The title of the book is *Nile and Jordan* (James Clarke; royal 8vo, pp. xi, 572, with maps; 36s. net).

---

#### HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND.

We are not satisfied with Mr. Stephen Paget's biography of *Henry Scott Holland* (Murray; 16s. net). It is quite good to read—we have read it from cover to cover. But we have the impression that Scott Holland was a bigger man than this. There is truth in the saying that no man is a hero to his valet, but 'valet' should be 'distant relative.' If this biography had been written by a wife or even a sister, or again if it had been written by one who was unrelated altogether, we might have seen its subject in his proper stature.

For Scott Holland was one of the great men of our day. Not only one of the greatest preachers, but one of the greatest men. His mental—or shall we say his moral—proportions were gigantic. Mental and moral were inextricably blended in him. What he knew he willed. And because he willed he knew. Of him, beyond most men we can think of, the great saying of Jesus was true, 'If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know.'

What was his driving power? It was Faith. Few men have needed faith more; few men have more unhesitatingly used it. There was a heroism in his use of it, like that of Abraham when he went out not knowing whither he went, like that of Moses when he endured as seeing the invisible. Could there be a greater trial of faith than the parting in early manhood between him and Nettleship? Most pathetic is Nettleship's cry, inevitably reminding you of the Gethsemane prayer, 'If it be possible let this cup pass from me.' He could not follow Holland in his faith and could not pretend to follow. Holland knew whom he had believed. When Nettleship perished on Mont Blanc, Holland wrote: 'I can think of nothing but that white silent body waiting for its burial, under the snows. It is such a strange end for him—he who never made a mistake, or got into a wrong place, or did the wrong thing, or slipped into any unsteadiness, or caused trouble. He was so reliable: he was sure to come through everything

right. Then, he was so bent on never making himself out heroic, or tragic. He would never startle anybody; or rouse interest; or evoke sympathy. He would always abhor doing anything that made demands on other people. And now, there comes to him this striking, terrible, lonely tragedy. It is horrible to me to think of that day and night: it must have been ghastly. I long to know more.

'Where the intimacy has been so close it cannot ever *grow* under the cloud of difference. But the old sense of it never failed on his side, or mine. And he was so loyal, and so supremely noble, with such high delicacy. . . . I cannot tell what he finally thought of Christ. I am given to accepting a fixed position, and not expecting it to alter. The line of thought which sometimes disturbed me in him was a sort of spiritual fatalism. But I know few whom one could leave so quietly to the mercy of God.'

---

#### THE NEW CAMBRIDGE SHAKESPEARE.

There is an old Cambridge Shakespeare. It was edited in ten volumes by Aldis Wright, and having been long years out of print, besides being as fine a bit of scholarship as ever was done on Shakespeare, it has been held as a precious possession by the comparatively few who possess it. If it was to be superseded, it was reasonable and right that only another Cambridge Shakespeare should supersede it.

It was also proper that the chief feature of 'the new' should be its text, for that was the great feature of the old. Two editors are responsible for 'a New Edition of the Works of Shakespeare edited for the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press'—Sir A. Quiller-Couch and Mr. J. Dover Wilson. The former is responsible for the Introductions, the latter for the text. And the text includes the notes, for they are almost altogether textual. In other words, this is a Shakespeare for the student and lover, not for the schoolboy.

It is a pocket edition. And so, there being much in it, the type is small. But it is clear and clean and the paper is good. There are in *The Tempest* (7s. 6d. net) two fine illustrations, one the Droeshout Portrait, the other the famous portrait of the Princess Elizabeth. Why the Princess Elizabeth? Because at her nuptials the *Tempest*



was played on December 27, 1612, and may have been written expressly for the betrothal night.

The editors' claim for their text is that it supersedes *all* other texts. And why should it not? But we pass to the Introduction and to the end of it. This is Sir A. Quiller-Couch:

'The lights in the banqueting house are out: the Princess Elizabeth is dust: and as for the island conjured out of the sea for a night's entertainment—

From that day forth the Isle has been  
By wandering sailors never seen.

Ariel has nestled to the bat's back and slid away following summer or else "following darkness like a dream." But still this play abides, after three hundred years, eloquent of Shakespeare's slow sunseting through dream after dream of reconciliation; forcing tears, not by "pity and terror" but by sheer beauty; with a royal sense of the world, how it passes away, with a catch at the heart surmising hope in what is to come. And still the sense is royal: we feel that we are greater than we know. So in the surge of our emotion, as on the surges rounding Prospero's island, is blown a spray, a mist. Actually it dims our eyes: and as we brush it away, there rides on it a rainbow; and its colours are chastened wisdom, wistful charity; with forgiveness, tender ruth for all men and women growing older, and perennial trust in young love.'

#### JOHN MARTINEAU.

John Martineau is worth adding to the round of our acquaintance even though the acquaintance is posthumous and on paper. But his biography written by his daughter, Violet Martineau, and entitled *John Martineau: The Pupil of Kingsley* (Edward Arnold; 12s. 6d. net), is of interest chiefly on account of the letters it contains. There are letters from Kingsley and Mrs. Kingsley, from Hughes (*Tom Brown's School Days*) and from Maurice—all new and nearly all keenly characteristic. Take this one from Tom Hughes:

'I am glad you are going to help boss the next Church Congress, but don't feel like taking up my parable again there. The two or three times I have attended and spoken I have only exasperated the parsonic mind and, I expect, done more harm than good. I am such a convinced Erastian in

Arthur Stanley's sense that I can't stand the Congress view, which regards the State (or nation, including all the good Christians who don't believe in or care a fig for Apostolic Succession) as a sort of antagonist to the Church.

'Congress has been going on for twenty years and more, and I don't see that we are a bit nearer getting rid of the Athanasian Creed, or getting an exchange of pulpits with Dissenters, or offering them any terms of admission into the National Church which they can seriously look at. If any one of my school can do any good, it is Llewellyn Davies, who is far the deepest and broadest theologian now living, and so, of course, is carefully passed over by dispensers of patronage. He has imperturbability as well as sagacity, in both of which qualities I am deficient, especially the first. Wherefore I am not sorry to have been shouldered out of active politics, though I take as deep an interest as ever in them and should like to have a good talk with you, though we should probably quarrel.'

In early youth Martineau became a private pupil of Kingsley's at Eversley and was set on his feet for life thereby, though one may easily see that he owed more to Mrs. Kingsley than to Kingsley himself. He wrote a chapter of Kingsley's biography. His only other literary work was the biography of Sir Bartle Frere. But while administering his property as a proprietor should, he did valuable public service, both as a County Councillor and in assisting the Charity Organization Society in its emigration work.

#### THE DEMONSTRATIO EVANGELICA.

It is astonishing that until now the *Demonstratio Evangelica* of Eusebius has never been translated into the English language. According to Lightfoot it is 'probably the most important apologetic work of the Early Church.' And it has very close affinities with the problems of the most modern Church. What could be more modern than this?—

'But there was a divine side to Christ, as is shown by His Miracles of mercy and love; He died voluntarily, rose again, and ascended to heaven. The miraculous in the life of Christ is in line with the miraculous in Christianity. Those who deny it must either prove that it was invented, or the result of sorcery. Now the type of teaching Christ gave His disciples is utterly opposed to



their inventing falsehoods. It was ascetic, and made truth and purity the first essentials of conduct. If you admit the fanciful hypothesis that He really taught them fraud and specious lying you are landed in absurdities. Deceit could afford no corporate cohesion, *κακῶ κακὸς οὐ φίλος*, οὐδὲ ἀγαθῶ: and again, what had they to expect but a death like His? After His death, too, they only honoured Him the more! They were even ready to die for Him. It is inconceivable that they knew Him to be really vicious. And equally impossible that, if they were, they should propose to convert the whole world, and actually do so, poor and uneducated as they were. You must imagine them meeting secretly after the Crucifixion, admitting Christ's deceit, and yet conspiring to propagate the Gospel-story: "Let us see," they say, "that our freak lasts even to death. There is nothing ridiculous in dying for nothing at all." "What could be finer than to make both gods and men our enemies for no possible reason? . . . And suppose we convince no one, we shall have the satisfaction of drawing down upon ourselves in return for our inventions the retribution for our deceit." Such theories are ridiculous, for there is no doubt that persecution and death faced the Apostles. Yet there was no traitor among them after the Ascension. And they actually succeeded in their adventure. Now this hypothesis of a conspiracy to deceive might be used with equal force with regard to Moses, or the Greek philosophers, and indeed all those whose lives history records.

'The simplicity, devotion, and ascetic lives of the Apostles guarantee their honesty. They faced all for truth and the Name of Christ. The Gospels reveal their modesty and straightforwardness in unexpected ways. It has been well said: "We must put complete confidence in the disciples of Jesus, or none at all"; distrust of them logically means distrust of all writers. Why allow invidious distinctions? The Passion is the crowning *crux*, how could they have invented a story which would handicap all their efforts? That they gave a true account of it really authenticates their accounts of the Miracles, and glorious manifestations of Christ.'

That is a fair summary of part of the third book. Now take a modern book. Mr. Gilbert T. Sadler, a clever and copious writer of the rationalist order, has just published a volume entitled *Behind the New Testament* (Daniel;

3s. 6d. net). It is mainly an answer to the commentary edited by Professor Peake. Which of Peake's arguments does he find most telling? It is this: 'No movement arising out of Judaism and led by Jews could have invented the story that its alleged Founder (the Messiah) had been crucified.' That is just the argument of Eusebius.

But at last the *Demonstratio Evangelica* has been translated. The translator is the Rev. W. J. Ferrar, M.A., a Sussex vicar and a scholar. We owe the book, however, to the enterprise of the present Secretary of the S.P.C.K., the Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, who not only secured its publication but assisted the translator, who says that 'but for his help it would be far more imperfect than it is.'

The translation is literal. But it is a translation. The Introduction also is well done, as the quotation made from it shows. The title is *The Proof of the Gospel* (S.P.C.K.; 2 vols., 3os. net).

#### BURMA.

How good is man's life, the mere living! how  
fit to employ  
All the heart and the soul and the senses for  
ever in joy!

So Browning; and so Captain F. Kingdon Ward, B.A., F.R.G.S.: 'There is perhaps no more lovely experience on earth than to awaken slowly to life after a long illness, much of which was a dark blank, with vague shadows projected on it from time to time; to see again the blue sky overhead, the golden paddy-fields, green forests and distant snow-clad mountains; to wake in the radiant dawn at the cry of gibbons shrilly calling from the jungle, when the mist hangs over the river and the first rays of the rising sun are sparkling across the blue mountain-tops; to hear the birds whistling and trilling and the silver-throated gong vibrating in the monastery. A vast peace seems to have enfolded the whole world in its embrace. You tread on air with winged feet, and sing, nay shout, for the very joy of living. Every leaf and flower, every bird and beast, every cloud in the sky, is revealed as an object of beauty, welling life and love. Happy the man to whom such revelation is permitted.'

Captain Kingdon Ward has explored that Triangle which is formed by the rivers Mali hka



and 'Nmai hka in Burma. Hitherto it has been one of the few still unexplored places of the earth. In the course of his exploration he endured considerable hardship, once being brought to the very gates of death. It is his recovery that he celebrates in that prose poem on the joy of living.

Captain Ward is a naturalist. His object was not exploration only, but also the discovery of plants and animals and especially insects. And it is when he has made an entomological discovery that he becomes most eloquent. 'Presently we came upon a remarkable sight. Some carnivorous animal had left its droppings in a rock pool amongst the boulders, and the poisoned water had tainted the atmosphere for yards around with its acridness. From all directions this reeking cess-pool had attracted the most gorgeous butterflies imaginable, and they had come in their dozens. The pool was a quivering mass of brilliant insects, and still others hovered to and fro over the unsavoury meal, awaiting their turn to alight; from time to time a butterfly, impatient of waiting, would push itself amongst the already packed multitude, causing a flutter of painted wings as the group rearranged itself like the colours in a kaleidoscope. Is it not curious that such beautiful, delicate, and outwardly dainty creatures should be attracted by such loathsomeness? It is apt to start a cynical train of thought on the corruption which underlies all material beauty and the empty vanities of life. But it was while watching, fascinated, those heaven-born insects that for the first time I realised the full magic beauty of Mendelssohn's *Papillon*, which ran in my head even as I watched the oscillating wings at the butterfly meet.'

Then follows an account of the different species of butterflies seen. 'Most lovely of all are the swallow-tails, of which there are a considerable variety in the hot, sunny valleys. These, as they probe the flowers for honey, scarcely settle, or if they do, touch with so light a caress the damask petals that they seem poised on air; and as they hover over, or tread with fairy pressure the bell-like convolvulus and trumpet flowers, their wings quiver and tremble like aspen leaves shivering in a zephyr breeze, never still for a moment. One of the most beautiful of these was a species of *Leptocircus*, with gauzy wings trailing out behind like fluttering ribands. How full of life they look, what restless energy in those slender bodies borne aloft on gorgeous wings! and how exquisitely the

first movement of *Papillon* represents to our ears the quivering, restless vitality here seen with the eyes! This music will ever carry me back to the Burmese hinterland, where I shall see again that rancid pool with its burden of butterflies by the thundering Mekh!'

The book is admirably written and as admirably illustrated. Its title is *In Farthest Burma* (Seeley; 25s. net).

#### CARDINAL MANNING.

Another biography of Cardinal Manning was inevitable. It has been written by Mr. Shane Leslie—the title, *Henry Edward Manning: His Life and Labours* (Burns Oates & Washbourne; 25s. net). A handsome attractive volume it is, with six illustrations.

Another biography, we say, had to come. For Roman Catholics were offended with Purcell's book, and non-Roman Catholics were puzzled. But now that it has come we wish—surely we must all wish—that it had not been written. Mr. Leslie has had access to many letters to and from the Cardinal which Purcell either did not know of or ignored, and he has made free use of them. What is the result? We simply see that the picture which Purcell drew was a true picture. Cardinal Manning was from first to last selfish, ambitious, jealous, vindictive. The true story of Archbishop Errington is even more objectionable than the story which we hoped was a false one. And although Mr. Leslie rushes over the relations between Manning and Newman, told at such painful length by Purcell, there is nothing in what he says to remove the feeling that Manning persistently misrepresented Newman at the Vatican (through the instrumentality of Mgr. Talbot) and prevented him from obtaining his Cardinal's hat, until the English Catholics rose in anger and went direct to the Pope about it. His vindictive persecution of Lord Acton is even emphasized. It is most disappointing, and even dismaying. How can a man be a Christian and be this?

What an asset his face was—is still, indeed—see the portrait placed as frontispiece to this book. But his face did not deceive everybody. Ollivier left a sketch of him at the Vatican Council: 'The love of domination is about him, and when his thin lips smile, it seems to be out of pure condescension. He is certainly pious and sincere,



wrapped in God, but he is not the emaciated monk he looks. Under his seraphic beatitude he retains a wheedling and energetic policy.' And his face was not his only asset. What a gift of persuasive speech he had. After his 'conversion' (Mr. Leslie makes the freest and fullest use of this word) he set himself to convert others, and he had gratifying success. He 'sought converts by letter and Apostolic visit. He must have posted a complete commentary on the Creed every week. He used a peculiar knock of four raps, and sealed his letters to seekers with the motto *qui patitur vincit*. "I promise you to become a Catholic when I am twenty-one," said a young lady. "But can you promise to live as long?" was the reply. Confession he called "fishing with a single line." Between 1851 and 1865 he kept a list of his converts in a locked book. They numbered 346, and though the titled names seem to justify his nickname as "Apostle to the Genteels," there were poets and parsons, and also the poor and the pariah.'

What was the secret? John Sterling (Carlyle's Sterling) met him in Rome when he was in the rush of it. This is Sterling's answer: 'He is one of the most finished and compact specimens of his school of manhood and of theology that I have ever fallen in with, and it was amusing to see how by faultless self-command, dialectic acuteness, coherent system, readiness of expression, and a perfect union of earnestness and gentleness, he always seemed to put in the wrong the gentlemen of the so-called Evangelical class, who muster strong here, and whom he frequently met with. He could not play quite the same game with me, for I knew better than most of them what I meant by my words. I conceive him to be, in his own place and generation, one of the most practically efficient and energetic men I have ever known, and in a state of freer and more fluent life in the ecclesiastical polity he would rise high and do "considerable things."'

He did not scruple, for the ends of 'conversion,' to conceal his feelings. Says Mr. Leslie: 'Manning was publicly fighting Pusey and privately converting Lady Herbert, to whom he wrote (December-10, 1864): "The truth, beauty, sweetness, self-evidence of the Catholic Church is beyond all I ever dreamed before I entered it. I wonder when those who enter it grumble and complain, and doubt whether they have souls or at least hearts."'

But at that very time he was engaged in a bitter struggle with his fellow-believers. 'It was Manning's novitiate in the sublime strife of ecclesiasts, and he suffered great depression. A haggard look, the hawk-like look of his antagonist, came into his own features. He could not understand the opposition of the Old Catholics to him, and when a convert remarked that he had expected them to have wings, Manning "smiled an exceeding bitter smile, and, as it were in spite of himself, let fall the words under his breath, 'Wings with claws!'"'

So. We have said enough, no doubt, to send our readers in a rush to the book. Be it so. It will give things to think about. This among other things, that the Kingdom of Heaven cometh not by observation nor yet by machination.

---

In *The Future Life* (Abingdon Press; \$1), Mr. F. B. Stockdale uses some plain, telling arguments for immortality. 'We have millions of birds that migrate every year. It would be a very foolish bird that argued, "There can be no Southland because I have never seen it." When we study birds we see that the *desire* is the answer. The scientist will tell you that if you find an instinct for the Southland, the Southland must be. You can have no native instinct for which there is no answer. What we wish now to notice is that the answer is a silent one. It has no words; it makes no argument; it simply *is*.' That is one argument, and a good one.

---

No form of literature has been harder hit by the War than sermon literature. It is a rare thing to receive a volume of sermons now. There is compensation, no doubt. If it does come it is likely to be worth reading. So is it with a volume which has been issued from the Cambridge Press, the preacher being Professor John Oman, D.D.

Professor Oman calls the book *The Paradox of the World* (9s. net). The title is taken from one of the sermons, a sermon on 'We know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose.' It is a favourite text, and its favourite divisions are—(1) all things work; (2) all things work together; (3) all things work together for good; (4) all things work together for good to them that love God. These are not Dr. Oman's divisions. They are: (1) It is the most unlikely



affirmation—'We know that all things work together for good'; (2) It is the most unlikely affirmation about the most unlikely persons—'to them who are the called according to his purpose'; (3) It is the most unlikely affirmation about the most unlikely persons and for the most unlikely reason—'to them that love God.'

To a series of small books entitled 'The Church's Message for the Coming Time,' a volume has been contributed by the Rev. J. G. Walker on *Religion and Human Progress* (Milford; 2s. net). Mr. Walker is very fair. He is so fair that he states elaborately the case of the anti-Christian and finds his space too short sometimes for a full answer to it. But at least he lets us see what we are up against.

*Behind the New Testament*, by Gilbert T. Sadler, M.A., LL.B. (Daniel; 3s. 6d. net). This book is mentioned on another page. The author's position is that 'Christianity was the pre-Christian Jewish Gnostic Gospel set into the Jewish mould of Messianic thought, and humanized as if it were a story of a Man on earth. The Gnostic gospel in Alexandria came first, telling of the Heavenly MAN in men, the Logos sown as the Saviour into souls. Such was the crucifixion or self-limiting of the Eternal God, called the Son of God, only-begotten (Plato used this term), and the Son of Man or MAN (as described in *The Book of Enoch*). This gospel was run into the Messianic mould of thought, and was humanised or historised by the outer circle of Christians after A.D. 70. Then the New Testament was written, A.D. 80-130.' No proof is offered. In a foreword, however, we are told that 'owing to the present conditions of production, it is impossible to elaborate the arguments given in this little book, or to make long and balanced statements on various subjects.' But for whom does Mr. Sadler write? Not for any one who is not already of his own way of thinking. For certainly no independent student of history holds by his dates or his developments.

Messrs. Duckworth have under issue a series of volumes on present-day topics, religious, ethical, and literary. They would have appeared in cloth before the War. Now they have to be content with paper binding and small type. But each volume is on a live subject, and each author is an

authority on it. This is the list—*Outline-History of Greek Religion*, by L. R. Farnell; *The Latin Culture*, by E. A. Burroughs; *The Study of Roman History*, by Bernard W. Henderson; *Treatise on Law*, by Edward Jenks; *Syndicalism*, by J. A. R. Marriott; *British Aspects of War and Peace*, by Spenser Wilkinson; *An Introduction to the Reading of Shakspeare*, by Frederick S. Boas; *The Bodleian Library at Oxford*, by Falconer Madan (2s. net each).

We are glad to see Mr. Boas again, even though he sticks to his spelling. In the course of his entertaining Introduction he succeeds in imparting much useful information. Thus, at random:

'In *Much Ado* (II. i. 77-8) Beatrice warns Hero that "wooing, wedding, and repenting, is as a Scotch jig, a measure, and a cinque-pace." The sting of the comparison lies in the character of the three dances. The Scotch jig was a wild round-dance; the measure was staid and formal; the cinque-pace had five steps, "like the tottering and uncertain steps of old age."

'Again the names of the coins mentioned in the plays are usually different from those familiar to-day, and Shakspeare often puns upon them, as in *Henry IV.*, Part II. (I. ii. 187-91):

*Ch. Just.* You follow the prince up and down, like his ill angel.

*Falstaff.* Not so, my lord; your ill angel is light, but I hope he that looks upon me will take me without weighing.

'The fat knight adroitly interprets "angel" as the gold coin, worth about ten shillings, which would not pass if it fell below a certain weight.'

No doubt you have that in Aldis Wright or in Verity, but the informality here is its virtue.

Dr. Farnell, Rector of Exeter College, Oxford, is the author of the article on 'Greek Religion' in the *ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*. Those who read that article will read this book. It is quite independent.

Dr. Arthur S. Hoyt, Professor of Homiletics and Sociology in Auburn Theological Seminary, has written a considerable number of books on preachers and preaching, and every book is true and telling, full of enthusiasm and free from extravagance. The latest is not the least. Its title is *The Pulpit and American Life* (Funk & Wagnalls).

The literary critic of a New York daily, reviewing



a book by Bishop Potter on Eminent Churchmen he had known, said: 'It was a pity so much ability and labor were spent upon men whose work was "entirely aside from the main currents of human interests."' Professor Hoyt's answer to that is a short biography and critical estimate of the great American preachers—Jonathan Edwards, Lyman Beecher, Channing, Bushnell, Henry Ward Beecher, and Phillips Brooks—and a demonstration of their influence over 'the main currents of human interests.' Then follow chapters on the Old and New Evangelism, some Distinctive Contributions to the American Pulpit, the Present American Pulpit, the Pulpit and Social Welfare, the Pulpit and the Nation.

And to-day? 'The absence of striking figures is not due to the poverty of the pulpit but to its excellence. We have many representative men—preachers that are men for occasions like Dr. Cadman of Brooklyn, Bishop McDowell of the Methodist Church; men that preach to special audiences as College men, like Hugh Black or Dr. Fitch or Dean Brown of Yale; preachers to the reason and the conscience, like Dr. Parkhurst and Dr. Jefferson; men who address the common needs and instincts of men, like Bishop Brent; men who appeal to the emotions, like Bishop McConnell; men who unfold the Scriptures, like Dr. Kirke of Baltimore. Men of the old theology, like Dr. Goodell and Dr. Woelfkin; men of the newer theology, like Dr. Gordon and Henry Sloan Coffin; men of rich rhetorical gifts, like Dr. Hillis: men of scientific plainness and precision, like Lyman Abbott; men with the social message, like Bishop Williams and John Haynes Holmes and Rabbi Wise. Such names suggest the fullness and many-sidedness of the American pulpit. The man who sees in the modern pulpit signs of decay, and talks of the giants of former days, must be singularly lacking in appreciation.'

Professor George Milligan pursues his tremendous task without even thinking, apparently, how tremendous it is. He has now issued Part IV. of *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-literary Sources* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net). It runs to the end of the letter L, and the letter L is the middle of the alphabet. Unfortunately for the editor, as the work proceeds it becomes more difficult, for new discoveries are being made, and

with every new discovery fresh examples are furnished; and more than that, fixed conclusions run the risk of being upturned. But the New Testament student knows all that, and we hope he also realizes the value of the Vocabulary, its quite indispensable worth for his work.

Tempting illustrations abound. Under κλήρος we read: 'The difficult κλήρων of 1 Pet 5<sup>8</sup> is probably best understood of the "portions" or "congregations" ("parishes," Tind. Cranmer) of God's people assigned or allotted to the presbyters.' This is Moffatt's 'charges'—'not by way of lording it over your charges but proving a pattern to the flock.' R.V. has 'the charge allotted to you.'

Grimm-Thayer calls κυριακός in 1 Co 11<sup>20</sup>, Rev 1<sup>10</sup> (ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ, 'on the Lord's day'), a biblical and ecclesiastical word; but examples from the inscriptions are plentiful. It means 'imperial.' Hence it has been suggested 'that the distinctive title "Lord's Day" may have been connected with conscious feelings of protest against the cult of the Emperor with its "Emperor's Day."'

In August 1918, Mr. Clement Hankey (brother of 'A Student in Arms') spent his holiday, along with a fellow-officer, in a walking tour through Palestine. They visited Gezer, Hebron, the Dead Sea, and Jericho. Then they passed to Carmel, and were most anxious to discover the exact spot at which Elijah had his altar erected. They crossed the Kishon and encamped on the reputed site of Harosheth of the Gentiles. Afterwards they went north to the Sea of Galilee and visited Nazareth. 'Presently, as we wound round the side of a hill, the great mass of Tabor came into view, rising like a camel's hump out of the plain. By eleven o'clock we were ascending its precipitous slopes by a broad path that rose from terrace to terrace, winding by easy stages to the top. Two convents, one a Latin the other a Greek, crown the heights of Tabor, having been built there in the pious belief that Tabor is the Mount of Transfiguration. Unfortunately the practical certainty that at the time of our Lord the summit of the mountain was occupied by a flourishing village entirely destroys the theory. In reality the ancient traditions of Tabor are military rather than spiritual, the place having been an important fortress during the later Jewish era.' The story is told simply and sincerely. There are few



raptures and no disappointments. The title is *Walks in the Holy Land* (Melrose; 4s. 6d. net).

Mr. E. Burney is a Christian layman who thinks that the Church as now organized is very near the end. He writes sympathetically, almost sorrowfully. What gives the Church its continued existence? It is public worship. But most men and many women are tired of worshipping. And what will the Church do then? Three things will be open to her—'(a) Teaching in such subjects as influence and are influenced by any religion that is alive—e.g., philosophy, psychology, political science, biology. (b) Research work in those and other subjects, of which astronomy might well be one. (c) Last, but certainly not least, healing. The existence of pain, disease, and lunacy are a perpetual and almost insulting challenge to the Church. It is her task to lead humanity to their conquest. The existence of the medical profession is a challenge to the Church. It is her task to swallow the medical profession.'

It all sounds odd, almost lunatic. But Mr. Burney is not a fool. Only we do not think that he realizes that the gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation. His book, which he calls properly enough *Christian Revolution* (Melrose; 5s. net.), should be read, probably more than once.

The leader of Bible Class, Literary Society, Fellowship Guild, or whatever the name is, should not fail to see *New Life* (National Adult School Union; 1s. 3d. net). It is the Adult School Lesson Handbook for 1921. Up to date and accurate, it is full of ideas that will fertilize in any active mind.

Mr. Fred Rothwell has translated and abridged a volume by Barthélemy Prosper Enfantin. The title is *Life Eternal: Past—Present—Future* (Open Court; 6s. net). Enfantin was a disciple of Saint-Simon and is spoken of as one of the founders of Saint-Simonism. But by and by he and the other Saint-Simonists disagreed over Enfantin's proposal to supersede the formula of Saint-Simonism, which was, in substance, 'the greatest good of the greatest number,' by another worded: 'to each man according to his capacity, to each capacity according to its works.' The breach was widened by Enfantin's announcement of his theory of the

relations between man and woman, which would have substituted for the 'tyranny of marriage' a system of 'free love.' Bazard hereupon separated from his colleague, taking over with him those whose chief aim was politics and philosophy. Enfantin then became sole 'father,' new converts were found, and he announced that his followers in France amounted to the number of 40,000. He wore on his breast a badge with the title of 'père,' was spoken of by his disciples as 'the living law,' declared himself to be the chosen of God, and sent out emissaries in quest of a woman destined to be the 'female Messiah' and the mother of a new Saviour. He regarded himself as not only the bearer of a heavenly message but as actually the Word of God incarnate. Then the authorities interfered and imprisoned Enfantin. This proved a deathblow to the society, and Enfantin, released after a few months, went with a few followers to Egypt, where he stayed two years and might have entered the service of the Viceroy had he been willing to profess himself a Mohammedan, as did some of his friends. He returned to Paris, and died there in 1864.

*Life Eternal* was his last work. Its idea is that we cannot die, for we were never born—as we understand birth. We had no beginning and so shall have no end. Eternal Life is of all the past as well as all the future. We are in God, who is all in all and always. 'God lives in all that is, He is Himself all that lives: the vine and the husbandman. The creator is the living creation; nothing exists apart from or outside of it, before or after it. God is one and manifold, although infinite; He is all relation, though absolute; all duration, though eternal; all space, though universal; all progress, though perfect.'

Under the title of *Purpose and Transcendentalism* (Kegan Paul; 5s. net), Mr. H. Stanley Redgrove, B.Sc., F.C.S., has published an exposition of Swedenborg's philosophical doctrines in relation to modern thought. In modern language it is a plea for the symbolical interpretation of Scripture. Take the story of the Creation. The 'theologian' first regarded it as a literal historical narrative. Then science showed that it is not historical, and the theologian was at his wits' end. Why did he not see from the beginning that it is purely symbolical?

Because it is not. And no man not a Sweden-



borgian can be persuaded that it is. The Swedenborgian ignores the fact that the same story is found in Babylonian literature and that the Hebrew narrative is an improved (that is less mythological) version. To ignore historical fact, which is at any rate bread, is not to live by the Word of God, it is to live on air.

Mrs. Marie Carmichael Stopes has been induced by responsible medical men to write the *Truth about Venereal Disease* (Putnam; 1s. 6d. net).

No one who knows the book will be surprised at the success of Mrs. Brightwen's *Side Lights on the Bible*. For it touches the most interesting things in the archæology of the Bible and always with illumination. A third impression is issued (R.T.S.; 3s. net).

The Rev. J. R. Cohu, M.A., indefatigable author, has written a book on the manifesto of the Lambeth Conference. *Addresses on the Lambeth Conference* he calls it (Skeffingtons; 5s. net). Opening with a good account of the Conference itself, he then discusses its pronouncements on the Reunion of Christendom, the Ministry of Women, the League of Nations, Capital and Labour, Marriage and Divorce, New Religions, Spiritualism, and Christian Science. He is in hearty agreement with the bishops on every point but one. On that one point, however, he is utterly out of sympathy. It is the use of the phrase, 'but also the commission of Christ' in the manifesto on Reunion. The whole sentence is: 'The Episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry as would be acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.' In a footnote he says: 'This one short clause, "commission of Christ," is likely to prove fatal to Reunion with non-episcopal churches. It emphasises that "divine right" and "Apostolic Succession" claim of Bishops which non-episcopalians will have none of. Moreover, Lightfoot, Gwatkin, and scores of able Biblical scholars to-day agree with them that there is not a tittle of historical evidence for such a claim.'

The Rev. Clement F. Rogers, M.A., Professor

of Pastoral Theology in King's College, London, is a better apologist than a pastoral theologian. How can a man who makes little of preaching be a good homilist? In *Why Men Believe* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net) there is nothing but wisdom, and it is wisdom well spoken. Belief touches the whole personality—emotion, intellect, will—and Mr. Rogers treats of each separately.

The Rev. J. M. Harden, B.D., LL.D., has compiled a *Dictionary of the Vulgate New Testament* (S.P.C.K.; 4s. net). He has used H. J. White's *editio minor* (Oxford, 1911), as he was bound to do. And one of the discoveries he has made is that that critical edition contains forty-four new words—words, that is to say, restored to the Vulgate which the former editors had dropped out. Three of them are not even in Lewis and Short's Latin Dictionary—*bithalassus* (Ac 27<sup>41</sup>), *secundoprimum* (as one word, Lk 6<sup>1</sup>), and *suprascriptio* (Mt 22<sup>80</sup>). Dr. Harden in his Dictionary gives the Clementine word in brackets when it differs from the Oxford text. And 'in order that the Dictionary may to some extent answer the purpose of a Concordance, the verses where a word is found are given, except in the case of the most frequently occurring words.' An asterisk after the last reference indicates that all the passages have been mentioned where the word in question is found in the Oxford edition.'

Some of the addresses which were delivered at the Student Christian Conference held in Glasgow last January have been published under the title of *Christ and Human Need* (S.C.M.; 3s. net). What has become of the others? None of Bishop Temple's are here. That is disappointing. It is also disappointing that there is not more grip in some of those chosen for this volume. We could have taken less of the attractiveness of Jesus if we could have had more of His power. But Mr. J. H. Oldham's address and Professor W. M. Macgregor's are gloriously strong and true.

The Rev. H. E. Fosdick, D.D., is the author of three books which have followed one another at intervals and may be said together to express his conception of Christianity. One is *The Meaning of Prayer*, one *The Meaning of Faith*, and one *The Meaning of Service* (S.C.M.; 4s. net). They are written for students; and for that reason



their contents are arranged in the form of Daily Readings, with a Comment at the end of every week's Readings. Each Reading contains a short passage of Scripture, a short comment thereon, and a short prayer. For all but the young and diligent student the worth of the book lies in the Comment. There are twelve weeks and so twelve comments. Each of them is an exposition of some topic—uselessness, the strong and the weak, the abundant life, self-denial, justice, and so on—all the topics being connected together as orderly parts of the life of service. The whole thing is extraordinarily well done.

*The Highway of God* (S.C.M.; 4s. net) is a comparatively small book (crown 8vo, pp. 176), but if we mistake not it is likely to become the power of God for salvation. It has been written by Kathleen Harnett and William Paton, Missionary Secretaries of the Student Christian Movement, and we take it that the purpose is to create in young men and women an interest in foreign missions. How is that purpose accomplished? In two ways. First by showing the need of a Gospel in India, China, Japan, the Moslem World, and Africa; and then by declaring what the Christian Gospel is. Now we have never had the state of affairs in these countries more credibly or more convincingly described, and we have never had the Gospel more truthfully or more persuasively set before us.

A certain pastor met one of his deacons after he had been round his district collecting for missions for the first time. 'Well, how did you get on?' 'All right; but James Brown says he does not believe in foreign missions.' 'Then you will have to score off his name.' 'Oh no, I won't do that. I told James Brown that I would continue to call upon him until he did believe in them.'

This book should be given to James Brown; and he should be told to read the last chapter first. For if he does not believe in foreign

missions it is because he does not believe in the Gospel.

There is not a great deal of novelty in *The Social Function of the Church* (S.C.M.; 6s. net). How could there be? But the author, Mr. Malcolm Spencer, M.A., has studied the whole thorny subject with more care than most of us; and as he has also consulted other students, he deserves to be read with deference. The most generally appealing part is the third on 'Applied Christianity.' It is also the most difficult part. What is a man of business to do? He is a follower of Christ and yet he cannot see his business go to the wall. It is in that 'yet' that the difficulty lies; for Christ and business in our day seem to be simply irreconcilable. 'The truth has seldom been more concisely put than by Lord Hugh Cecil in his book on *Conservatism*. "The competitive system," he says, "is certainly not a Christian system. The governing motive of those who are engaged in industry or commerce is self-interest, not love, and Christianity indisputably requires that the mutual relations of all men shall be controlled by love. To buy as cheaply and sell as dearly as possible; to obtain labour at as low a wage as it can be got; to work only as much as is necessary to obtain employment; to strive, whether as employer or employed, to gain for oneself at the expense of others—these are not the acts characteristic of Christianity."'

Mr. Spencer's way out is by appeal to the individual. 'Without prejudicing the question what ultimate changes in the system of business and industry may be required, we come now to the problem of individual Christian action amid the difficulties of the present situation. The watchwords of Christianity are co-operation, service, character and fellowship, as opposed to competition, self-seeking, gain and strife. The Church has to insist on these ideals against the contrary philosophies and standards.'



## Antichrist.

BY THE LATE REVEREND B. B. WARFIELD, D.D., LL.D., LITT.D., PROFESSOR OF DIDACTIC THEOLOGY IN PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

WE read of Antichrist nowhere in the New Testament except in certain passages of the Epistles of John (1 Jn 2<sup>18, 22</sup> 4<sup>3</sup>, 2 Jn 7). What is taught in these passages constitutes the whole New Testament doctrine of Antichrist. It is common, it is true, to connect with this doctrine what is said by our Lord of false Christs and false prophets; by Paul of the Man of Sin; by the Apocalypse of the Beasts which come up out of the deep and the sea. The warrant for labelling the composite photograph thus obtained with the name of Antichrist is not very apparent. The relations to one another of the figures which enter into this composite portrait are at best *sub lite*, and can be determined only when each of them lies clearly before us in the light of the passages which plainly present it to us. The name of Antichrist occurs in connexion with none of them except that presented in the passages of the Epistles of John already indicated; and both the name and the figure denoted by it, to all appearance, occur there first in extant literature. The Old Testament tells us nothing of Anti-Messiah. Neither has he been discovered in any of the fragments of pre-Christian Jewish literature which have come down to us. If John had not himself told us that a doctrine of Antichrist was already current when he wrote, both the doctrine and the name might have been with great plausibility ascribed to him as their originator.

John does not tell us in what quarter the doctrine of Antichrist to which he alludes was current. Nor does his allusion enable us to form any very full conception of the doctrine that was current. We learn merely that there were people who declared 'Antichrist is coming!' It appears to be implied that Antichrist was thought of as an individual, and his coming as, though certain, yet still future—as apparently, in fact, a sign of the impending end. We cannot go beyond that; perhaps not quite so far as that. And as to who it was who were asserting, 'Antichrist is coming!' John leaves us completely in the dark. Possibly he is adducing a current Christian belief, some more or less 'faithful saying and worthy of all acceptance' in circulation in the Christian community. It is even conceivable that he is adducing an item of authoritative

Christian teaching, of which we should have known nothing had he not preserved it for us—a fly in his amber. This, however, does not seem very likely in itself, and does not find much support in the use John makes of the saying he quotes. He does not deny, it is true, that there is truth in it; and he utilizes the truth that is in it for his own teaching. But he at least seems to correct it; and in correcting to supersede it. If it is an item of authoritative Christian teaching, it certainly is valid to us only as preserved for us by John and in the interpretation which he puts upon it in preserving it.

It appears far more probable, however, that John is adducing not an item of Christian teaching, but only a current legend—Christian or other—in which he recognizes an element of truth and isolates it for the benefit of his readers. In that case we may understand him less as expounding than as openly correcting it—somewhat as, in the closing page of his Gospel, he corrects another saying of similar bearing which was in circulation among the brethren, to the effect that he himself should not die but should tarry till the Lord comes. The language in which he speaks of the manner in which his readers came into knowledge of this saying does not forbid this view of its origin. When he says, 'Ye heard, "Antichrist is coming!"' it is not implied that they heard it 'once for all' in the sense that they had it from a source confessedly authoritative (cf. Mt 5<sup>48</sup>). It is only implied that what they heard was something which was definitely communicated to them, so as to be put completely in their possession. From whomsoever they heard it, what they heard was unquestionably this—'Antichrist is coming!' When John replaces the aorist here with the perfect at 4<sup>3</sup>, he does not confound his tenses, but only emphasizes the fact that what his readers had heard still lay in their minds as part of their effective contents. He is correcting not only a statement which his readers remembered once to have heard, but an assertion present at the moment to their thought, and exercising, or in danger of exercising, actual influence upon their beliefs and expectations.

Now John is not willing to leave matters in this condition. Whether he is merely expounding the

true meaning of what his readers had heard, or is substituting for it a truer doctrine, he makes three declarations concerning Antichrist which appear to traverse its implications. He transposes Antichrist from the future to the present. He expands him from an individual into a multitude. He reduces him from a person to a heresy.

The phrase which, John tells us, his readers had heard—'Antichrist is coming!' does not in its very language, to be sure, project his coming into the future. It is the certainty rather than the futurity of Antichrist's coming which it emphasizes; and it had perhaps, as heard by his readers, put them in a quiver of expectation of his coming—creating some such situation as that against which our Lord had warned His followers (Mk 13<sup>21f.</sup>). It was so far future, however, that it was supposed not yet to have taken place. When men are saying to one another, 'Antichrist is coming!' they mean very distinctly to say that he has not yet come. And we cannot be wrong in inferring, from the use which John makes of the saying, that his coming was connected, by those who made use of this cry, with the end-time. The coming of Antichrist seems then to have been presented as a matter of dread anticipation by which men's imaginations were oppressed. John meets the situation thus produced by a very definite assertion, that, so far from being a matter of future expectation, the coming of Antichrist had already taken place. Antichrist is not a future but a present phenomenon; not a thing to be looked forward to in nameless dread, but a thing to be courageously met in our everyday living. John makes this assertion with the utmost emphasis (4<sup>8</sup>). This thing, he says, 'is *now* in the world—already,' that post-positd 'already' carrying with it the utmost strength of assertion. There is no doubt about it at all; Antichrist is here among us, now, already.

In doing this John does not so much separate Antichrist from 'the last hour' with which he had been connected as correct the notion which had perhaps been entertained of the phrase, 'the last hour.' 'The last hour' no more than the Antichrist is a matter of the future; it too belongs to the present. The time we are living in—that is 'the last hour.' For 'the last hour' means just the Messianic period, the period after the Messiah has come. We may call it, with reference to the true coming of our Lord, the inter-Adventual period. Of course there could be no Antichrist until this 'last hour' had come. How could there be an

Antichrist before there was a Christ? The fact, then, that Antichrist has come (γεγονασιν, 2<sup>18</sup>)—that the phenomenon is 'now in the world—already' (4<sup>8</sup>),—is proof enough that the time we are living in is the 'last hour' (2<sup>18</sup>). Thus, with the dismissal from reality of a distinctively future Antichrist, John dismisses from reality a distinctively future 'last hour.' The 'last hour,' as he knows it, began with the coming of Christ, and fills the whole spacious period which extends till He shall come again.

He not only, however, dismisses Antichrist from the future; he deprives him of his individuality. In the place of an Antichrist, he substitutes 'many Antichrists.' And he declares that, already when he wrote, still in the first Christian century, a multitude of these Antichrists had come into existence. It is very customary, it is true, to represent John's 'many Antichrists' as rather fore-runners of Antichrist, types of Antichrist, preliminary embodiments of the spirit of Antichrist and the like. It is not so, however, that John describes them. He calls them just 'Antichrists,' and he sets them over against the individual Antichrist of which his readers had heard as the reality represented by that unreal figure. His precise 'just as . . . so' cannot be robbed of its assertion of the exact correspondence of their appearance with all that was really to be expected from the assertion that Antichrist would come. Nor can his argument be stultified, that the presence of these Antichrists in the world prove it was already 'the last hour.' Predecessors of Antichrist might prove that 'the last hour' was approaching, only actual Antichrists could prove that 'the last hour' had already come. There can be no question, then, that John volatilizes the individual Antichrist into thin air and substitutes for him a multitude of 'Antichrists.' We may say, no doubt, that they embody the spirit of Antichrist; but not as if they prepared the way for its subsequent concentration in a single baleful figure, but as superseding that figure altogether and taking the place which had been assigned to it. Least of all can we appeal to Jn 4<sup>8</sup>, 'And this is the *spirit* of the Antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it cometh; and now it is in the world already,' as implying that John after all recognized the reality of an individual Antichrist. These words recognize only the actual existence in the world of an antichristic spirit. Even this, indeed, is probably more than is said; the generalizing phrase which is used seems to be



studiedly indefinite, and perhaps declares only that refusal to 'confess Jesus' sums up in itself all that is true in 'this whole matter of the Antichrist.'

For John not only erases the individual Antichrist from the scroll of prediction, but reduces him just to a heresy. 'Who is the liar,' he demands, 'but he who denies that Jesus is the Christ? This is the Antichrist,—he who denies the Father and the Son' (1 Jn 2<sup>22</sup>). 'Every spirit,' he declares, 'which confesses that Jesus is Christ come in flesh is of God; and no spirit which does not confess Jesus, is of God: and this is that antichrist of which you have heard that it is coming: and it is now in the world already' (4<sup>8</sup>). 'There are many seducers,' he declares again, 'who went out into the world, even those who do not confess Jesus as Christ coming in flesh. This is the seducer and the antichrist' (2 Jn 7). In one word, 'Antichrist' meant for John just denial of what we should call the doctrine, or let us rather say the fact, of the Incarnation. By whatever process it had been brought about, 'Christ' had come to denote for John the Divine Nature of our Lord, and so far to be synonymous with 'Son of God.' To deny that Jesus is the Christ was not to him therefore merely to deny that He is the Messiah, but to deny that He is the Son of God; and was equivalent therefore to 'denying the Father and the Son'—that is to say, in our modern mode of speech, the doctrine—in fact—of the Trinity, which is the implicate of the Incarnation. To deny that Jesus is Christ come—or is the Christ coming—in flesh, was again just to refuse to recognize in Jesus Incarnate God. Whosoever, says John, takes up this attitude toward Jesus is Antichrist.

This was an attitude which could not fail to be taken up in the presence of the lofty claims made by and for Jesus as the Incarnate God. Wherever these claims were made known, there this attitude was sure to show itself. The presence of the God-man in the world inevitably produced it. It is therefore an attitude which characterizes the age of the God-man, and that is as much as to say the Messianic period, to which the name of 'the last hour' was given. This is why it was natural for John therefore to connect the presence in the world of this heresy—which he speaks of as 'Antichrist'—with the 'last hour,' which is only another name for the Messianic age. That Antichrists existed in John's day was accordingly a matter of course. It is equally a matter of course that they continue to

exist in our day. So long as a Divine Christ is confessed in the midst of a gainsaying world, so long will there be, as in John's day, many Antichrists.

What John's allusions to Antichrist teach us therefore is that the development of Christianity in the world—the transformation of the world by Christianity—is not to be accomplished without conflict. If Christianity is an evolution, it is also (as all evolution is) a struggle; and Christianity survives in the end only as the survival of the fittest. We cannot proceed on the supposition that the world may be overcome without strife; and the strife is mortal. For two thousand years now the battle has been in progress. It is far from fought out yet. The many Antichrists which still beset Christianity and clog its progress will certainly be succeeded by many yet to come, who will certainly not be behind those which have preceded them in baleful power. Are they to increase in malignancy until at last all that can be called Antichrist is summed up in one great Antichristian movement, or perhaps in one great Antichristian person, the Antichrist by way of eminence? It may seem that in the nature of the case this might well be so. As the knowledge of Christ grows in clarity as well as in extension, the opposition to Christ might well be ever more and more compacted into ever deeper hatred, expressing itself with ever more concentrated effect. This, however, is not John's representation. Such a history for Christianity in the world he certainly did not contemplate. He does not even suppose that Antichrists will always exist in the world. He tells us plainly enough that Christianity must fight its way to victory. But he tells us equally plainly that it is to victory that it fights its way. He sees the victory as clearly as he sees the conflict. 'The world,' says he,—the evil world of unbelief—'is passing away'—is in actual process of passing away. It required some courage of faith for John, looking out from the midst of the little group of despised Christians in Asia Minor upon the surrounding masses of heathenism, to say that. But he says it. 'The darkness is passing away,' he says again, 'and the true light is already shining.' 'Already'—that little word carries in its bosom a glorious prophecy. John already foresees the time when the Antichrists who swarmed around him and who are now swarming around us, shall no longer exist, because the light which he saw already shining, shall have broadened into the fullness of the day.

# The Problem of Suffering in the Light of the Book of Job.

BY PROFESSOR ED. KÖNIG, D.D., BONN.

IF ever there was a time in the world's history that urgently called men to face the question of the meaning of human suffering, that time is the present, when the storm-cloud of adversity has burst in a torrent over so many nations. In examining the problem of the motive and purpose of such suffering it is only natural that we should think of that book in Holy Scripture where we read of how a once happy life was crushed down by sudden catastrophe. How often has the book of Job been admired and imitated by princes among the poets, such as Dante and Goethe! Let us then examine closely this magnificently constructed work of art, in the hope that perchance we may discover in it an interpretation of the problem of pain that will bring light and comfort to our own troubled hearts.

But when, in our eager search for instruction, we have proceeded only a short way in our study of the book, the fear is awakened in our minds that it does not present a harmonious and consistent solution of the problem of the purpose of suffering. Can unity, indeed, be looked for in a book where so many different personalities pass judgment on the matter, and where the sight of pain leads to manifold controversies? To a superficial glance it is anything but a harmonious view that presents itself to us.

1. For the Satan, the 'adversary' who roams the earth only in quest of material that will further his pernicious designs, suffering is simply a means of *tempting* man. He would use it to sow in the heart the seeds of suspicion as to the justice, nay, the very existence, of a Disposer of the world's history. In destroying the property and the health of his victim he hopes also to destroy his confidence in the goodness and the impartiality of Providence. He purposes to lay in ruins the proud edifice of prosperity and piety, and to plant upon the ruins his banner of scepticism and pessimism.

Whilst this malicious conception of the aim of suffering is not shared by the so-called friends of Job, and we thus experience a measure of relief, it is true all the same that the book thus discloses to

us a twofold view of the problem. The friends regard suffering as *penal*. They champion the doctrine that all suffering is the punishment of human transgression. Their confidence in the strength of their contention is shown by the circumstance that three times over they step into the arena to dispute in its favour (chs. 4-14, 15-21, 22-31). Nay, their theory is not repudiated *per se*, even by the hero of the book, who objects only to the application to himself of the general principle. Not by any means that he declares himself absolutely innocent, as is often assumed. It is from his own mouth that we hear the question which answers itself in the negative: 'Who will seek to find one clean among them, seeing there is none' (14<sup>4</sup>)? What he denies is that the frightful measure of suffering that has overtaken him is proportional to his sin.

The diversity of judgment regarding the woes to which man is subject is still further exemplified, when a new speaker, Elihu, interposes in the controversy (chs. 32-37). He contends that the Disposer of events is to be regarded not as an enemy (33<sup>10</sup>) but as a *trainer*, who only punishes until he can let man go because he has found 'a ransom' (33<sup>24</sup>), and the sufferer has been brought to recognize his sin (v.<sup>27</sup>). The Divine aim has been reached, when God has 'brought back the soul of man from destruction, and enlightened him with the light of the living' (v.<sup>30</sup>). Elihu thus represents a view intermediate between the two extremes—God is neither to be viewed as if He makes use of suffering solely for penal ends, as the friends contended, nor as one who unjustly denies the just claims of an innocent man (34<sup>5</sup> 35<sup>1</sup>), or is careless in the matter of retribution (35<sup>14</sup>), as Job had suggested. God's real function in this matter is that of an instructor (36<sup>10</sup>) and teacher (v.<sup>22</sup>), whose unsearchable power and majesty must be honoured with humble reverence (37<sup>24</sup>).

2. Is it, then, only the explanation of suffering which is put in the mouth of *God Himself* that is to be regarded as the consistent and harmonious one?

From time to time down to very recently (e.g.



in Budde's *Handkom. z. Buche Hiob*, 1913, p. xxxviii) we read of a 'wager' which God has made with the Satan in the prologue. This assumes that it was God that took the initiative, which is contrary to the text. No, what happens is that, when 'the adversary' proposes a plan whereby he may seduce the relatively pious man from allegiance to his ideals, God only *consents* to the visitation of Job with misfortune, while at the same time imposing the condition that the life of the sufferer is to be spared; and He cherishes quite a different design from that of the Satan. God desires and hopes that His servant Job, when faced with misfortune, will *stand the test*, and His expectation is not falsified. It is not through suffering itself that Job's steadfastness is shaken, as we see from 2<sup>10</sup>. It is only after his friends, breaking their silence (2<sup>18</sup>)—a silence which is itself a condemnation—proceed to weigh in the scales of a Shylock his terrible sufferings against his sins that he breaks forth in a monologue of despair (3<sup>3-26</sup>) and a mistaken arraignment of the order of the universe. Thus, according to the prologue, suffering is sent by God to test and *confirm* the faith of man.

Is it the same view of the aim of suffering that is expressed in the addresses put in the mouth of the Almighty in 38<sup>1ff.</sup>? There the unsearchable power of God is exhibited by referring to the world of Nature (notably the two creatures, the hippopotamus and the crocodile, 40<sup>10-19</sup>. 20-41<sup>25</sup>), whereby Job is brought to see that, in spite of his guarded criticism of the Divine government of the world, he has been too hasty in his demand for a recognition of his relative innocence. In other words, the addresses of the Almighty are themselves a new source of suffering and as such serve the same end of confirming the faith of Job. Directed as they are towards preserving him from *arrogance* in his view of the constitution of Nature and the order of events, they serve to purify his character and so help to complete the *establishment of his steadfastness*. When this result of the Divine toil with his soul (cf. Is 43<sup>24</sup>, 'Thou hast made me to serve') has been acknowledged by Job in touchingly humble words (42<sup>3-6</sup>), God expressly announces that suffering in the case of this man has accomplished its purpose of *establishing* him, and this is formally recognized by the restoration of his former prosperity.

3. But, even if the attitude of the Almighty to human suffering is consistent and harmonious in

those passages where he plays a part, yet, as we have said, the book presents *four* theories on the subject. Let us ask now *whether even these may be combined so as to form a unity*.

This question, looking at it first of all from the point of view of the *form* of the book, would naturally be answered in the affirmative, on the ground that the author, anticipating Plato, shows himself such a master of the art of unfolding truth by means of the dialogue, or rather of exhibiting all the sides of a truth by allotting its discussion to a number of persons. Again, when we consider the *contents*, all the four replies which the book gives to the question of the purpose of human suffering may be understood as the harmonious parts of one comprehensive view. They may be regarded as *the four reactions* and interpretations to which the advent of suffering gives rise in the soul of man.

Is it not the case that, as a rule, when a wave of misfortune breaks upon us, the *first* result is to tempt us to abandon the thoughts we have hitherto cherished about God? If this storm has been weathered, our *second* impulse is to regard our sufferings as a punishment for sins of which, however numerous may be our good points, we feel that we can readily accuse ourselves. Once we have been brought to see in our experiences the chastening hand of the Disposer of events, then, if we are honest in our efforts, we reach *the further stage* when, with Elihu, we see in the arm that punishes also the action of a wise teacher who in holy love waits for the moment when He may let us go because he has (brought round) our soul, that is, turned us back from following a mistaken course in our interpretation of the course of history. We are helped *finally* to learn this lesson by contemplating what the God who spoke to Job from the whirlwind presents to our view, namely, the incomprehensible power and majesty of the Creator of the universe. We thus learn humility, and, through our contemplation of the wondrous works of God in Nature, are led to infer the grandeur, surpassing knowledge, of His disposal of the world's history.

To sum up. The answer of the Book of Job to the question, What is the purpose of human suffering? is to the following effect. It is intended partly as a means of strengthening against faithlessness in the battle of life; partly as a punishment of the sins of which men are guilty; partly as a

means of purifying individuals and nations ; and finally it is to be regarded as part of the arrangement of a universe which exhibits in what is comprehensible so many indubitable indications of wisdom and goodness that we have the fullest warrant for attributing to its Author a wise and

beneficent purpose also in the relatively small dose of ills and sufferings we discover in the constitution and the history of the world.

This solution of the problem of suffering, offered to us by the author of Job, will approve itself as correct for all time.

## In the Study.

### *Virginitas Puerisque.*

#### Rearing a Monument.

'Now Absalom in his life time had taken and reared up for himself the pillar, which is in the king's dale: for he said, I have no son to keep my name in remembrance: and he called the pillar after his own name.'—2 Sam. 18<sup>18</sup>.

MOST of you have been taken at some time or other to see a monument or statue erected in memory of some famous man. Perhaps you were visiting a strange city and among the sights of the place there was pointed out to you the statue of a man who had been born there and who had afterwards made a name for himself in the world. His fellow-townsmen were proud of him ; they wanted to recognize his great gifts, and they wanted to connect his name always with their city ; so they erected a monument to his memory.

But were you ever taken to see a monument which a man had erected in honour of himself? Of such a monument we read in this verse out of the old sad story of Absalom.

Absalom could not bear to think that he might be forgotten. Admiration was the very breath of life to him. He would rather have been hated than not noticed. But he had no son to carry on his name. So he took this curious way of having his memory kept green. He built a monument to himself.

Now Absalom's name *has* been remembered, but not in the way he intended. It has been remembered as the name of a treacherous son who plotted against his own father and tried to deprive him of the throne. It has been remembered as a name for vanity, selfishness, and ingratitude. In the end of the day he lay, not near the pillar he had erected to his own glory, but in an inglorious grave in a lonely forest, and over his grave was cast a great heap of stones. Near Jerusalem there

is a monument which is called Absalom's Pillar. Very probably it is mistakenly so called, but the Jews and Muhammadans believe it is the original pillar. And every Jew who passes throws a small pebble at it and utters a solemn curse to express his disapproval of the man who 'set at light' his own father. So is Absalom's name remembered.

Men have done strange things to have their name remembered. One man set on fire the beautiful temple of Diana at Ephesus, so that he might not be forgotten. Some men are remembered for their cruelty, others for their cleverness, others for their beauty. Artists, poets, musicians have left behind them monuments in the works they have created. But there are others who have left behind them a better monument than any of these. They are remembered for their loving, self-sacrificing service to others.

Some years ago a missionary was visiting a village in the East of Africa. He was staying with the chief of the village, and one day an old native presented himself at the dwelling of the chief and asked to see the white man. He wished to see him because he hoped he would resemble the only white man he had ever known. Over his shoulder the old native carried with great care and tenderness a mouldy, moth-eaten coat, and he told the missionary that it had once belonged to 'the white man' and that he had kept it for ten years. He went on to describe his friend. 'He treated black men as his brothers,' he said, 'and his name will be remembered up and down the Rovuma valley long after we are all dead and gone. His eye was piercing, but his words were always gentle and his manners were always kind. He knew the way to the hearts of all men.'

Then very carefully the native took the mouldy coat from his shoulder and gave it to the missionary to keep, because he came from Britain and



was a brother of the great white man, who was none other than David Livingstone.

Boys and girls, what kind of a monument are you raising? Whether we will or not we are all leaving our mark on our day and generation. God has endowed us with gifts of mind and heart, and how we use these gifts decides the kind of monument we are rearing. There are just two ways we can use them. We can squander them on themselves, on our own glorification, our own pleasure, our own comfort and profit, or we can spend them in helping and serving our fellow-men. Absalom tried the first way. He had great gifts of body and mind. He was beautiful and brave and clever. He had great charm of manner. He was a born leader of men. Had he acted as a true son, he would in time have succeeded to the throne, and he might have been known through all Israel as a great and good king. But he cared only for his own selfish ends, his own glory, and he came to an inglorious and unhonoured end.

David Livingstone tried the other way. He gave himself up entirely to serve God and his fellow-men, and he earned the love and esteem of all men, both black and white.

Boys and girls, which are you going to imitate—Absalom or David Livingstone? What kind of a monument are you going to rear?

#### A Happy Couple.

‘I will trust and not be afraid.’—Is 12<sup>2</sup>.

The moorland I am thinking of was not considered a pretty place. On the contrary, people used to say that it made a blot upon the country side.

But a little couple had chosen it as their home, and had built a very tiny house on a tangled clump of herbage. Travellers across the moor spoke of it as a peat-bog, but the words had no meaning for Mr. and Mrs. Pipit. The place was exactly to their mind and they were happy in it.

The husband had a brown coat with light edging, and a spotted waistcoat, and his dear wee wife was so dainty that boys and girls were always eager to get even a glimpse of her. It was a very happy time when the couple were building their little house and trying to make it a sweet place to live in. They had no money; God provided the things with which to build and furnish it. These were a few dried stems of grass and moss, and

their bed was made soft and warm with tufts of bog-cotton and thistle-down.

When I made her a call just now  
I found she had furnished her house somehow,  
All trim and tidy and nice and neat,  
The prettiest cottage in all the street.  
Of thistledown silk was her carpet fine,  
A thousand times better and softer than mine;  
Her curtains, to shut out the heat and light,  
Were woven of blossoms pink and white;  
And the dainty roof of her tiny home  
Was a broad green leaf like an emerald dome.<sup>1</sup>

When the couple talked to each other, Mr. Pipit always ended his story in a lovely song. Sometimes, but not often, they had sad things to speak about. ‘Sweet-one, sweet-one,’ Mr. Pipit would say then, ‘we won’t let any one come near our little house. Trill-trill,’ and then there followed a note of wonderful joy. ‘I know it, I know it,’ Mrs. Pipit answered tenderly, ‘no robbers . . . we two . . . together.’ Then Mr. Pipit sang his favourite ‘Happy Song.’ It was full of exquisite trills and cadenzas, for his little heart felt bursting with happiness, and what added beauty to it was the pathetic ending. There was an echo of longing, perhaps even of anxiety in it. Dear little Mr. Pipit! Mrs. Pipit just nodded her wee head coquettishly and said, ‘Sweet-sweet; sweet-sweet.’

Not far from Mr. and Mrs. Pipit’s house there was lodging the very person of whom they were afraid. She had no home of her own; she was a vagrant and hated housekeeping. One day when the Pipits were out she peeped into their snug little house, and saw two wee eggs amongst the cotton and thistle-down. They were whitish with a great many brown spots. She gave no thought as to whether they were pretty or not, she just said to herself, ‘They’re nearly the same colour as my egg, I will bring it and put it in the nest; Mother Pipit will have quite forgotten that she had only two of her own. Kwow-ow-ow-ow,’ she said, and went off. Very soon she saw the couple start out again for messages. Back she went carrying the egg in her mouth and laid it in Mother Pipit’s soft bed. When the fond mother returned and peeped into the soft nest, she put her head first to one side, then to the other, turned the eggs and called Mr. Pipit, saying, ‘Three-two; three-three-

<sup>1</sup> ‘My Neighbour,’ in *A Garland of Verse*, p. 180 (ed. A. H. Miles).

three.' He perched beside her and said, 'two, two, three,' touched number three, and then sang such a lovely song that Mrs. Pipit soon felt happy and satisfied. 'God gives,' 'trill . . . trill,' 'Sweet-sweet' could be heard in the house all the afternoon.

One morning there were two little Pipits in the nest. The day following a very big baby appeared, and it gaped as soon as it was born, screeching, 'Give me something to eat; give me something to eat.' Mrs. Pipit brought all sorts of nice things for it. Mr. Pipit whispered to her, 'Sweet-sweet, he's so big, do you think . . .?' and he followed his question with a trill and a lovely song. 'Think-think,' said the anxious little mother, 'he is—baby,' and she wore out her strength trying to find hairy caterpillars to put into the great open mouth.

Very soon the strange baby grew so big and strong that there was scarcely room for him in the little home, and he began to hate the little Pipits. One day, when father and mother Pipit were out, he shuffled himself about amongst the cotton and the thistledown until he got one of the babies on his back, then put his head well down in the nest and gradually worked up backwards until he reached the edge of the nest. He rested for a moment, then gathered all his strength together, and with one final effort sent the little helpless Pipit down. Wasn't he selfish and cruel? And he was only a baby himself; he hadn't even got his sight at the time.

Of course Mr. and Mrs. Pipit missed the absent one. For a moment they were sad; then they said 'Sweet-sweet' to one another, and went on to feed their big greedy foster-child. He throve and grew until he was nearly as big as a pigeon. It was hard indeed to feed him; Mrs. Pipit sometimes had to stand on his back in order to do it, the greedy, gaping child turning his head and crying impatiently, 'I'm hungry; give me something to eat.'

One day the overgrown vagrant child left the Pipit cottage and never came back. Mr. and Mrs. Pipit looked at each other and said, 'Sweet-sweet,' 'sorry-sorry.' Then Mr. Pipit sang a song with not a single sad note in it. His little heart had really no room for sorrow—there was still one baby in the nest.

The homeless bird felt very miserable indeed when he found himself all alone in a wide world

with no loving Mrs. Pipit to look after him. One day, sitting very tired and hungry in a furze bush, he nearly broke his heart when he thought of the hairy caterpillars she used to give him.

A boy crossing the moor chanced to see him. He did not want to frighten the bird, but he took a few crumbs from his pockets and laid them down not far from the furze bush. They did not lie there very long, for he had not passed far on his way before the sound of 'Cuck-oo, cuck-oo,' reached him. Mrs. Pipit's greedy foster-child was actually thankful!

Even the cuckoo, child of Ishmael,  
With but two notes and no place where to  
dwell,  
Still does his best his grateful thanks to tell.<sup>1</sup>

And the Pipits just went about saying 'sweet-sweet,' 'sweet-sweet.' They were not always together, however. One day, when Mr. Pipit was away alone, he sang a very lovely song near an open window at which a frail old gentleman sat. 'Put out a few crumbs for the little songster,' he said to a young girl who was keeping him company. Mr. Pipit came and ate them, made his most graceful bow, flew to the twig of a bush and sang again with a joy that made the old gentleman feel young again. Only Mrs. Pipit could have told the words of his song, but the white-haired listener thought he understood them just a little bit.

'Hand me the little book I was reading in the morning,' he said to the girl. Then he opened it at a page he had marked, and in a trembling voice read:

The wonderful trust of a birdling!—  
So full and so free!  
For what does it know?—Not the smallest thing  
Save its own concerns, and those it learns  
'Neath the mother-wing and instinctively.

And yet it is happy as happy can be,  
Enjoying each moment right merrily,  
It knows not at all what to-morrow may bring,  
And yet it can cheerfully chatter and sing;  
To-day is enough; yesterday has no sting;  
It carries no load, for it simply trusts God  
For its home, and its food, and for everything.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> J. Oxenham, *All Clear!* p. 64.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 64 f.



## The Christian Year.

WHITSUNDAY.

His Presence.

'I will come to you.'—Jn 14<sup>18</sup>.

The practice of the presence of Christ is based on the fact of His present living activity. Now in the New Testament we have two main lines of thought on this subject: (1) The promises of Christ to be with His followers, and (2) their witness to His faithful keeping of the trusts.

1. It will not be necessary to examine all the words wherein Jesus said that He would still be in the midst of His disciples after His death, but here are a few. It was under the shadow of the coming Calvary, in the Upper Room when fear was striking a chill into the company gathered there, that He spoke words bright and radiant with hope. 'I will not leave you desolate,' orphaned, forlorn; 'I am coming to you. If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come and make our abode with him.' And then He speaks of the Spirit, the Comforter, who is to come as His *alter ego*, and in whose coming He comes, and in whose presence He is present. It may be a theological inexactitude to speak of the Holy Spirit as the spiritualized presence of Christ, but devotionally and practically it is a help to conceive of the Spirit as such. He is the Spirit of Christ, He takes of the things of Christ and illuminates them. Wherever the Spirit is there is Christ, for *the Lord is the Spirit*.

But apart from these references in John's Gospel we have the words of promise to those who unite in prayer: 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them'; though we often use the words as only a charter for our corporate prayer, they are the promise of His presence emphatically and distinctly: for prayer in its essence is communion. Whether Jesus was adapting a rabbinical saying that where two were engaged in the study of the law there was the shekinah, matters not, for here He lays down one of the fundamental laws of life. 'His presence is axiomatically certain.' He is always there in the midst according to His promise.

When the Seventy were sent on their mission, in His ordination charge He told them that they were His ambassadors and representatives, 'he that heareth you, heareth me; and he that rejecteth you, rejecteth me; and he that rejecteth me, rejecteth him that sent me.' What is that but saying

that as His Father was present with Him when He evangelized, so His presence was to be with them?

When Jesus told the allegory of the sheep and goats, He said the sheep were welcomed and goats rejected on the ground that the sheep showed love and the goats none, to the 'least of his brethren,' and He identifies Himself with these waifs and strays. He is present, and to Him we minister in the personalities of the outcast. When Paul met his Lord on the Damascus road, he was challenged, 'Why persecutest thou me?' and here the identification is with the persecuted disciples. Jesus was present with them: and He is present in every cause in which His disciples are engaged.

And there is that mystic saying of His, recently dug up at Oxyrhynchus, 'Wherever there are two, they are not without God; and wherever there is one alone, I say, I am with him. Raise the stone, and thou shalt find me; cleave the wood, and there am I.' The mystic word has surely a precious truth to convey when it suggests that the mason or the carpenter may find Jesus present with them in the daily round of the workyard and shop. If the mason and the carpenter, why not every other trade and every right way of earning a living? 'In the handiwork of their craft is their prayer,' and prayer brings the realization of the presence of Christ.

And finally there is the all-sufficient promise when our Lord in Galilee gave His command for universal evangelization, 'Go into all the world . . . lo! I am with you all the time, to the end of the world.' Seldom surely has so great a command been entrusted to men; here was One, claiming all authority—the Omnipotent Jesus, issuing with imperious word a command which knew neither limits of space nor time, and claiming to be able to accompany His servants whithersoever they went on their high embassy. The Omnipotent promises His Omnipresence: the Risen Jesus is affirming a universal presence.

2. Now pass to the fulfilment of these manifoldly rich promises. In the appendix to Mark, that Gospel fragment has for its last verse the words: 'They therefore went forth preaching everywhere, the Lord working with them and confirming the words by the signs that followed.' The words sum up the Acts, for that early record of the generation following Christ might be termed 'The Acts of Christ through the Apostles,' and none would have more gladly accepted such a designation than the Apostles themselves. Each in turn

would have acknowledged that their words and work were due not to them, but to the Spirit of Christ which energized them.

(1) The best and most accessible case is of course that of Paul, for we know his mind and heart better than any of the others, and are providentially allowed to see what was a standard experience of Christ. Paul was an epitome of many men, and touched life on more sides than most. The autobiographical passages from his pen are witnesses to this aspect of Christian life. If ever a man practised the presence of Christ, had clear and definite first-hand knowledge, Paul was that man. From that pregnant day on the Damascus road, right on through his varied career till in Cæsar's City, he knew what it was to have his Lord standing by him, when all others had forsaken him. His favourite expression for a Christian, his pocket definition, as it were, was 'in Christ.' We need not understand that his own personality was annihilated, but that he lived and wrought in the presence of his Lord: it is the consciousness of spirit meeting with spirit, of the inter-relation of his heart with God-in-Christ, indwelling and ruling and obsessing, but never destroying the freedom of his own will: it is the deliberate and resolute action of his will yielding itself up to Christ as his Captain, whose banner he follows into the thickest of the battle: it is the momentary and quick realization that wherever he was Christ was with him, giving him strength and wisdom, peace and joy and love. Christ dwelt in his heart by faith, and life for him spelt one word, Christ. It is needless to give quotations, for a quick reading of the Apostle's correspondence will convince every one that for Paul there was nothing worth thinking of, or living for, no other ambition worth striving after, but how to be acceptable to Christ whose slave he was. It made him a mystic, it made him an evangelist and an apostle, it made him one of the great creators of our modern world. It gave him a name which after his Master's is the greatest in the history of man. But for that he cared nothing.

Paul has no honour and no friend but Christ.  
Yes, without cheer of sister or of daughter,  
Yes, without stay of father or of son,  
Lone on the land and homeless on the water  
Pass I in patience till the work be done.  
Yet not in solitude if Christ anear me.

Wherever he went he found the Presence of Christ—in Antioch, in Galatia, in Macedonia, in Corinth, on the wild waters, in Rome. Wherever he woke Christ was still with him.

(2) What is true of Paul is true also of the other Apostles, though our knowledge of their inner life is more scanty. Christ was present in their meetings, and by His Spirit was the spring of their activities, guiding, upholding, guarding. But there is no need to examine the subject, for the New Testament later writings are a text-book for all who would practise the Presence, and no one can read the book without discovering that if the writers were sure of one thing more than another it was that Christ had risen from the tomb and was with them, a constant Friend and Saviour. He had been with them; He was still with them; He was to appear at the last day with a Presence or coming more awe-inspiring, majestic, glorious than anything they had yet experienced—these three thoughts are the very points of the orbit on which their life and service revolved.

(3) The Apostolic age is one continued fulfilment of the promises of His Presence, and in every age since the word has been kept. He has never failed the heart that trusted Him. The saints of all ages and every Church have proved it. They affirm it as a real experience and are like the late Sir Edward Burne-Jones: 'I never doubt for a moment the real presence of God. I should never debate about it any more than I should argue about Beauty and the things I most love.'<sup>1</sup> It is a real catholic article of Christian living, and of it may be said the great words, *quod semper, ubique et ab omnibus*, always, everywhere, and by all. In martyrdom and persecution, in Church assemblies and lonely hermitages, in employments both religious and common, on service in foreign lands, wherever hearts have turned to God they have found He is with them. And the saints add their long and ever-increasing roll of witness to this truth, lying at the very core of the religious life. They have realized and they have loved and felt the awe of the Presence of God in Christ. Even when with complete assurance they have been tempted to locate it, saying, 'Christ is with us, but not with you'; 'Lo! He is here, but not there,'—they have been right in their affirmations, but wrong in their denials. He is not confined to any four walls of man's building. We cannot limit

<sup>1</sup> *Memorials*, ii. 325.



the Presence of Christ, since He is everywhere. It is His Presence which alone gives consecration to life. For all life, truly considered, is dependent upon and saturated with God if only we had the eyes to see and the hearts to understand.<sup>1</sup>

### TRINITY SUNDAY.

#### The Trinity.

'According to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through (R.V. "in") sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.'—1 Pet. 1<sup>2</sup>.

The three clauses of this verse beyond all reasonable question set forth the operation of the Father, the Holy Spirit, and the Son respectively. Here, therefore, as in several Epistles of St. Paul (1 Co 12<sup>4-6</sup>, 2 Co 13<sup>13</sup>, Eph 4<sup>4-6</sup>), there is an implicit reference to the Threefold Name. In no passage is there any indication that the writer was independently working out a doctrinal scheme: a recognized belief or idea seems to be everywhere presupposed. How such an idea could arise in the mind of St. Paul or any other apostle without sanction from a word of the Lord, it is difficult to imagine: and this consideration is a sufficient answer to the doubts which have, by no means unnaturally, been raised whether Mt 28<sup>19</sup> may not have been added or recast in a later generation. St. Peter, like St. Paul, associates with the subject of each clause, if one may so speak, a distinctive function as towards mankind: on their relations to the Divine Unity he is silent.<sup>2</sup>

1. The functions assigned to the three divine Persons respectively are described throughout the New Testament in language that varies according as its context relates to the unity of Church life, to spiritual endowments for Christian service, to the sanctification of the individual, to human effort, or to Divine grace, or to the relation of the Godhead to the world as a whole.

(1) To the Father are attributed love, foreknowledge, choice, sovereignty, all effective working.

(2) To the Son the grace of condescending, the atonement of suffering, mediation in the bestowal of the Spirit, the consummation of the glory of humanity, the mercy of final judgment.

(3) To the Spirit the regeneration and renewal of human nature, the fellowship of spiritual life in

the body of Christ, the indwelling of the divine in the human, the growth in holiness.

2. These attributes may fairly be grouped under the familiar headings of the doctrinal summaries of later ages—creation, redemption, sanctification.

(1) In the present passage one of the parts of creation is made prominent—foreknowledge. Now it is easy to interpret this idea in such a way as to make it seem arbitrary, despotic, fatalistic; but those who have eyes to penetrate below the surface of things cannot get away from it; they refuse to believe that the universe is without a settled purpose at the core of it; they do not feel as if they themselves had been saved by chance or by caprice. St. Peter himself in his Pentecost sermon had used a very strong phrase of this kind about the Cross of Christ: 'Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken' (Ac 2<sup>23</sup>). And if even the Cross, which seemed at first sight so much like the negation of all rule, all order, and all right, was no afterthought, no accident, no unforeseen misfortune, but the shining centre of God's plan, Christian souls had some reason for being sure that a thread of purpose ran through all things, and that, being brought into the Kingdom of the Lord, they had been laid hold of by the Eternal Design. The saints have ever had this consciousness, though they might not be able to explain it, or to reconcile intellectually the two sides of it. Their Christian life was their free response, but it was a response: something else had gone before it. 'I have loved thee with an everlasting love.' 'We love because he first loved us.'

(2) Redemption is spoken of as 'obedience and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.' We put the experience of cleansing first, and the way of obedience afterwards. But three times at least the Bible inverts that order. Probably the idea here is an echo of Ex 24, where there is described the making of the covenant between the elect people and their God. 'Moses took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient. And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words.' The same order of thought is followed in St. John's famous saying: 'If we walk in the light as he is in the light, we

<sup>1</sup> W. J. Ives, *The Ever Present Christ*.

<sup>2</sup> F. J. A. Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, 17.

have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin' (1 Jn 1<sup>7</sup>). And this is the order in the passage before us now. In one sense the Cross comes first; it is the beginning of all: it is the root and motive of our obedience. Yet in another sense it is only the loyal and surrendered heart that has a right to claim the benefits of the Redeemer's passion. A Peter and a Pilate were equally close to the Cross viewed as an historical event, yet only to the disciple soul was the Cross turned into a gospel.

(3) That which is election in the Father appears as sanctification in the work of the Spirit. Sanctification is setting apart. The root idea of the word is just separation from common uses to the service of God. The saint is one who has separated himself from known evil in an act of consecration, which is prolonged through all his after-life; and who is animated by but one aim and purpose—to be only for Jesus. We cannot do more than this; nay, we cannot do this without the Holy Spirit. From Him comes the first conviction that we are wrong; and the indication of the infirmity, or weight, or evil, from which we must get free. From Him also comes the grace by which we are set free. From Him comes the in-filling with the love and life of God, which is inseparably connected with each act of consecration. And thus there is evolved at last the obedience which pleases God; and which is thus wrought through—and in—sanctification of the Spirit.

#### FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

##### The Propitiation.

'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.'—1 Jn 4<sup>10</sup>.

In this sentence there is one word which calls for interpretation above the rest. The Latin term from which our English 'propitiation' comes means that which may render propitious one who has been offended. The Greek word which St. John uses in this place (and in 2<sup>2</sup>) has almost the same meaning—that which promotes or secures reconciliation. In the New Testament and the Septuagint the reference of the propitiation offered is invariably Godward, and the suggestion which inheres in the classical use of the term, namely, that 'goodwill was not conceived to be the original and

natural condition of the gods, but something that must first be earned,' is altogether foreign to the Biblical scope of the term. The righteousness which requires atonement and the love which provides it meet in the profound harmony of the Divine attributes.

1. It is, however, the Hebrew word which concerns us most nearly. The father of Samuel Taylor Coleridge used to speak of Hebrew as 'the authentic language of the Holy Ghost.' Certainly, it is in that language that we find the key to the meaning of the significant terms of Scripture. The Hebrew word which St. John undoubtedly had in mind signifies literally 'a covering.' The priestly service in Israel was summed up in the sacrificial action of the High Priest on the Day of Atonement, and of that action the sprinkling of the offered blood upon the golden plate of the mercy-seat—'the propitiatory'—was the culmination and crown. It represented a sheltering life, albeit a life laid down—interposed between the Shekinah presence and the condemning law, thus *covering* the covenanted House of Israel. The life of the sinner is therefore preserved by the interposition of another life, divinely bestowed and divinely accepted.

A father sees an arrow speeding towards his boy; with a cry he flings himself in its way; the arrow pierces the father's heart, and he, dying, secures deliverance and safety for his son. Even so, Christ died for us, interposing His life between us and the punitive justice of God. And still, between us and our adversary, the life of the Son of God, once offered, now taken again, is interposed. 'He *is* the propitiation for our sins.' It is not merely that He has effected something, secured something, for us, but that He in His own person *is* our ransom, our reconciliation, our redemption. The late Dr. Edwards of Bala was engaged with his admirable treatise on the atonement, when this thought burned itself into his mind. He rose from his desk, leaving his books and papers as they lay, went into the street, and cried aloud, 'Jesus is the atonement! Jesus is the atonement!' Then he returned to his study to write down sentences such as these: 'This is the atonement—not the sufferings and not the death, but the person of the Son of God in the sufferings and in the death. He is the propitiation. . . . It is not said that He made the atonement, nor that He paid an atonement. I do not condemn those expressions, but the Bible



goes far beyond them. He is the propitiation. . . . He is the atonement—not He Himself without the act, but He Himself in the act. . . . The atonement is eternally offered to the Father in the person of the Son.’ Dr. Edwards concludes his consideration of this topic by warning us not to tarry in the doctrine, but to come by way of the doctrine to the person: ‘The atonement is not an event that took place in Palestine, but lives in heaven in the person of the Intercessor, and the person is as accessible, yea, more accessible to us by faith than He was to the weary and heavy-laden who saw Him on earth.’

2. Since this is so, the atonement has the virtue of an eternal act, its efficiency is ever present. Between us and the Cross there is nothing. ‘The Church’s is an everlasting Easter.’ Luther used to say, ‘I feel as if the Lord Jesus had died only yesterday.’ It is not even so long ago.

Upon the Cross of Jesus  
Mine eyes at times can see  
The very dying form of One,  
Who suffered there for me.

‘The passion of the Lord is here,’ exclaims Bernard of Clairvaux, ‘here, this very day, breaking the rocks, shaking the earth, opening the tombs.’ This blessed truth is illustrated in the Apocalypse by the presence, in the midst of the throne, of ‘a Lamb, as it had been slain.’

3. The word propitiation implies that the love that leads us to salvation and draws us into fellowship is a love that is revealed in righteousness. If it behoved the Christ to suffer, if without shedding of blood there is no remission, if it is only through the scarlet stream of cleansing that the holy nation shall have entrance into the city and find access to the tree of life—there must have been some unspeakably solemn reason why God should hide His face and withhold comfort from this world of men. The reason is written in broad letters on our conscience, ‘We have sinned.’

In the *Cur Deus Homo* of Anselm, his pupil is represented as objecting to the shedding of sacrificial blood. The teacher replies, ‘It seems that thou hast not sufficiently considered the weight of sin’s burden.’ Perhaps such a rebuke might be addressed to us all. Who among us has experienced adequate sorrow for sin? Yet, on the other hand, how many there are, who, under the conviction of the Holy Spirit, have mourned in words

which the penitent King of Israel wrote as if in tears and blood: ‘Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.’ From the Cross this answer is returned: ‘The chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed.’ What the heart craves for, what the conscience requires, is a salvation that will enable a just God to be the justifier of the ungodly. Adolphe Monod represents the awakened sinner addressing Christ in these terms: ‘Save first the holy law of my God; after that, Thou shalt save me.’ It is a righteous salvation that is provided. And the grace displayed in the gift and sacrifice of a Redeemer has so fully satisfied divine justice that righteousness exercises its prevailing plea even upon a Father’s heart, usually so swift to discover reasons in virtue of which one may be permitted to forgive. ‘We have an advocate *with the Father*, Jesus Christ *the righteous*.’<sup>1</sup>

## SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

### In Love.

‘This is his commandment, That we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, as he gave us commandment.’—1 Jn 3<sup>23</sup>.

The secret of a life free from anxiety and worry is the dominance of an overmastering passion. Take the nearest and most frequent analogy provided by the experience of ordinary human life. Take the love of man for woman and woman for man. We cannot account for it by any reasoned analysis. A man does not fall in love of premeditated design, he does not argue himself nor, by any effort of will, force himself into love. He meets some one to whom his nature instinctively responds, and gradually or quickly this response strengthens, till the day arrives when he becomes aware that his happiness depends upon life-union with the woman who has aroused it. Doubtless this experience has its antecedent conditions which later on he can, if he thinks it worth while, to some extent analyse and distinguish. The self which thus seeks completion in another self is the outcome of the interplay of many forces and influences; of natural endowments, hereditary tendencies, of education, of social surroundings; and the same statement holds good of the other self. They are at first congenial to each other, and later on

<sup>1</sup> D. M. McIntyre, *Love’s Keen Flame*.

become necessary to each other, because their dispositions correspond, and this correspondence is largely due to the circumstances of their birth and training. But at the time of the experience itself there is little or no consciousness of this antecedent process. The only consciousness is that of being under the sway of a great passion, masterful and dominating and all-absorbing.

How does this affect the man's general outlook, his way of regarding and treating the people he meets, and the affairs he has to transact, in the ordinary intercourse of life? At first it generally has to some extent the effect of secluding him from them, and lessening his interest in them. Lovers are at first proverbially selfish. They are inclined to think only of each other, and to be absorbed in each other's companionship, and this means to some extent neglecting their former friendships, and cutting themselves off from their former pursuits. But this is only a passing phase. Friends soon begin to reassert their rights, business affairs have to be attended to or they will go awry. Even the most devoted lover has to maintain his place, and to discharge his duties, as a member of the community to which he belongs. But he does so in a new spirit, and with a new zest and energy and hopefulness. The experience which has come to him transforms the whole world for him, it illumines everything with its own radiance. The sun shines more brightly, the birds sing more sweetly, the landscape reveals new beauties, commonplace incidents become more interesting, everyday intercourse more attractive, even the drudgery of monotonous toil no longer depresses him as it used to do. And then as to his worries and forebodings, those anxieties for the future which are the chief cause of man's unhappiness, what about them? Why, he finds that they have disappeared as the mountain mist melts away before the rising sun. They have not been confuted by any argument, nor expelled by any act of will. They have passed out of the arena of his consciousness; he no longer thinks about them or is distressed or depressed by them. He looks out on the future and he sees it peopled with bright forms and pleasing anticipations; he has found his heart's desire, and this suffices him not merely for to-day, but also, as he imagines, for the days which are yet unborn.

1. This experience, which we cannot call fanciful or exceptional, for it is as old as human history

and is being re-enacted every day, provides the nearest analogy to the master-experience of Christ, and of those who approach the problem of life under His guidance. Christ was dominated by an overmastering passion. He was dominated by love for God. God was the one supreme and all-inclusive object of His heart's desire. He lived in constant communion with Him. His will was in complete accordance with the Divine will, and the acts and words in which His will expressed itself had for their sole aim the effecting of God's purposes and the establishment of His supremacy. Looking out on life thus it is little wonder that He was undisturbed by its passing trials and rebuffs, that He could gaze into the future with clear and confident eyes, and through the gloom-clouds of threatening calamity could see the fair land of promise where His Father dwelt, and where, when He had finished the work which had been given Him to do, He would rejoin Him. Doubtless there were times when physical or mental anguish was so acute that His consciousness of the Divine Presence seemed for a moment to become blurred and indistinct. Such an experience seems to have come to Him in Gethsemane, and to have repeated itself in more intense form on the Cross. But in each case it was only temporary, only a passing storm on the surface of a life-stream which went on unchecked and unabated. 'Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me,' He pleaded as He lay outstretched in Gethsemane; but His next words, 'not my will, but thine be done,' retract the plea. 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' He cried as He hung in agony on the Cross; but His final words, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,' show that before the end came He knew that God had not forsaken Him.

2. As Christ was, so Christians are, though in a very imperfect degree. They are Christ men, men who share Christ's spirit and act on His principles, and look out on life and its experiences as He looked out on them. The Christian life, in its ultimate analysis, is the life of the love of God. The initial act by which a man enters consciously into that life is, if we may so describe it without irreverence, an act of falling in love with God. This episode, or rather its different aspects, is referred to in the New Testament as faith, or conversion, or regeneration, and just as in the case of its human analogy it has its antecedent conditions.



Only the pure in heart can see God; only those who will to do His will can know Him. But the experience itself is spontaneous and instinctive; it is the response of the self to another self in which it finds its complement and completion. Sometimes it comes as love at first sight comes, suddenly and unexpectedly, like the lightning flash in a darkened sky. Sometimes, like the sun rising up behind the eastern hills, it is the consummation of a gradual process. But sudden or gradual, the outcome is the same. The man has found God, and has bound himself to Him by ties of conscious loyalty and love, and he knows that henceforth life has but one centre for him; that all its efforts and experiences come from God and lead back to Him; that, like the angels whom Jacob saw descending and ascending the celestial ladder, they bear messages of love from God to him, and can, if he will, bear back similar messages from him to God. It is thus that he looks out on life, and interprets the different strains which make up its complex melody. He has learnt that its master-strain is love, and as he listens to this even apparent discords become parts of an all-embracing harmony. The cadence of God's love fills his ears, the brightness of God's love illumines his vision, the warmth of God's love wraps him round as a mother enfolds the child whom she bears in her arms. He is a God-lover, dominated by an over-mastering passion which carries him forward with it, to the fulfilment of its purpose and the completion of its desire.<sup>1</sup>

### THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

#### Believers.

'Unto you which believe he is precious.'—1 Pet 2<sup>7</sup>.

1. Speaking broadly, Christ's life, Christ's mission, divides itself into two parts, closely related yet deeply distinct. Into one of these divisions must be put the various ministries of speech and action which marked His busy career. The other aspect of Christ's work comprises His essential mission, that which He shared with no man, which no man shared with Him—the work of reconciliation between heaven and earth, the work of redemption amid a dead and lost humanity. Now it is quite clear that men may take note of the former of these divisions, the wise utterances, the beneficent activities of Christ's true daily life, without ever perceiving or admitting the latter, the essential aspect of

His spiritual place and mission. So if we take this outer ministry of Christ, this ministry which attracts men of all creeds and no creed, we shall find it so many-sided as to touch mankind on a thousand points of interest, all of them true, all of them helpful, but all of them falling short of men's deepest spiritual concern.

(1) For instance, here is an artist, roaming through history in quest of an ideal man, a man of symmetric grace and truth personified, and his eyes and ears are closed to everything except this symmetric and beautiful man; and he comes across Jesus Christ and he says that God has given answer to his quest, and he bows before Christ as before the apotheosis of the beautiful, one in whom the spirit of art is caught up into an eternal and perfect embodiment of form.

(2) For similar reasons Christ constrains the attention and the admiration of thinkers and teachers. Wisest among the wise, speaker on those deepest themes of life and destiny which claim even while they baffle human thought, He has left behind Him an account of man, his origin, his quality, his destiny, which demands attention, which throws light on many of our most perplexing enigmas.

(3) To the moralist, again, Christ stands forth as a Man who to a marvellous degree succeeded in brushing away the webs of casuistry from moral questions, and in cleaving a way through a mass of tangled maxims and rules right down to the essential and simple principles of right conduct. Nowhere shall the student find a teacher who reduced morals to so transparent a simplicity, or transfigured them by such spiritual emotion. Dispossessing human consciences of those arbitrary laws and hindrances which pressed like death upon them, He gave to men the eternal principle of right conduct and lifted the whole domain of morals into a purer and clearer air.

2. Now all these estimates are true, but they are special and partial; they are all framed on some particular aspect of the outer day ministry of Christ; not one of them takes account of His spiritual and redemptive mission. Our text introduces quite a different class of persons, and suggests a widely different estimate of the Christ. 'Unto you which believe he is precious.' 'You which believe.' That class includes all the sections mentioned—artists, philosophers, writers, moralists,

<sup>1</sup> W. H. Carnegie, *Personal Religion and Politics*.

statesmen, men of commerce, men of industry, men of all ranks and conditions; but it does not include them on the ground of their specialism. Its distinguishing feature is 'believe,' 'trust.' It includes men who, beneath all their special tastes and functions in life, are believers in the Christ. They do not merely attend to Him, agree with Him, admire Him; they trust Him.

Now it is clear that this attitude is at once different from and broader than those we have been considering. What account shall we take of it? In one word, these believers have learned this simple truth that the outer ministry of Christ, thronged as it is with gracious deeds and beautiful with a spirit which the world will never let die, does not exhaust all that He came to be and to do; that the sympathetic appreciation of this sermon, or that miracle, or that deed of kindness does not fulfil our present relation to Him. These believers have learned that there is another and essential aspect in which Christ is to be found, the aspect of Reconciler and Saviour between heaven and earth; that He came above all things to seek and to save the lost, to endow dead men with life, and by that gift of life to raise the whole quality and destiny of mankind. These believers have felt in their own experience the need of such a Deliverer, and out of a broad and deep conviction they have risen to the belief that Christ is the Deliverer that they need; and so there is an attitude not merely of respect, or agreement, or admiration—it is the attitude of a soul conscious of deep, even eternal needs, and of the glorious reality that in Christ God had answered the needs

He awakened in the soul. And so the Christ they see is more than teacher, reformer, embodiment of beauty, worker of great deeds, hero, leader; He is essentially and supremely Redeemer.

Once, my life was sad and dreary,  
Love Divine I did not see:  
Seeking earthly gain and pleasure,  
Yet despising heavenly treasure—  
Jesus had no charm for me.

Though the Spirit shone within me,  
And His light I needs must see;  
Sin and danger clear revealing,  
To my future fears appealing—  
Still He had no charm for me.

But I saw His tender pity  
As He hung upon the Tree;  
All my guilt and sorrow sharing,  
All my sins upon Him bearing—  
Then I felt His charm for me.

Oh, the depth of love and mercy,  
Daily in His care of me!  
While my thankful, joyful spirit  
Found through His infinite merit  
More and more His charm for me.

Praises to the Lord of glory!  
He who died now lives for me:  
Through His perfect mediation  
I have now a full salvation—  
He is all-in-all to me!<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> J. Mountain, *Steps in Consecration*, 18.

## Traces of Targumism in the New Testament.

BY RENDEL HARRIS, RYLANDS LIBRARY, MANCHESTER.

It is said that the custom still prevails in the Jewish synagogues in Yemen of S. Arabia of following the reading of the lessons of the Old Testament by the Aramaic translation which we know under the name of Targum, a translation in which, on the one hand, the Scriptures were rendered from the classical Hebrew into the popular vernacular; and on the other hand, such changes were made and such expansions allowed as would secure the right understanding of the

text on the part of the worshipper, as regards both the text itself and its dogmatic implications.

What we have extant in Yemen synagogues is a survival; and, although the connecting links are not to be detected in any continuous form, we know enough to say that it is a survival from Palestinian custom and from a time at least as remote as the beginning of the Christian era: it does not follow that the Targum goes back so far as that time as an actual script; its genesis as a



written document is a much debated matter. If it began in oral form and was continued as an oral tradition, then we have an oral Volks-Bibel; if it assumed a literary form, it became an actual Volks-Bibel. In one form or the other it was the Volks-Bibel both of the early Christian Church and of the contemporary and almost coincident Jewish Synagogue. Both the Church and the Synagogue, for example, read the Book of Daniel in Targum, except for some preliminary sections. The Aramaic of Daniel is the Targum on Daniel. Hence those persons are wrong who tell us there is no Targum on Daniel: the text of Daniel, for nearly the whole of the book, is the Targum on Daniel. Equally at fault is the statement which is sometimes made, that there were no written Targums before the fourth or fifth century; but whether they were written or not, the Christian Church must have passed through a state of Targumism, if it emerges from the synagogue in which Targumism prevails: from the Aramaic it ran out into the use of another popular Scripture, the Septuagint. If we prefer to say so, two streams of popular Scripture and interpretation of Scripture flowed on side by side; the one spread over Eastern and Western lands, the other disappeared in the sands of Arabia. But the victory of the Septuagint was more than the triumph of one translation over another; there was a dogmatic triumph involved, the triumph of Christian Hellenism over reformed and reforming Judaism. For consider the theological meaning of Targumism, over and above its meaning as a translation. Its main object is the glory of God in the deletion of unworthy conceptions of God: it was the knife held at the heart of anthropomorphism: it was an attempt to conserve the conception of God in Glory, almost in Agnostic terms, by saying that 'He has no hands,' 'He has no feet,' 'He does not speak with voice, nor smell with nostril,' nor locate Himself spatially, nor 'come down,' nor 'go up.' These negative conceptions, with which we are familiar, were the natural result of Monotheism raising itself to the various degrees of abstraction, and were easily incorporated with some forms of Greek thought, as we may see, for instance, from the protests of Aristides in his Apology that God has neither form, nor colour, nor limbs, nor sex. But the zeal against anthropomorphism does not find a ready response in Greek circles, where the long experience of over-humanized

Olympians was harder to be eradicated than the scattered Hebrew expressions of God who walked in a garden, or God who smelled a sacrifice. If the Christian Church breathed the air of Targumism at its birth, and it almost surely did, it accomplished the growth of its earlier years under a change of atmosphere. This will be admitted readily enough by students of the New Testament. They would probably say off-hand that the New Testament and the Targums have nothing in common: the Aramaic elements in the N.T. are due to the speech of Jesus outside the synagogue, and not of Jesus and His disciples, acting as Meturgemans inside the synagogue. Occasionally, however, a suggestion is made that the exclusion of Targum from the N.T. is too sweeping: thus in Mr. Walker's article on Targum in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* we are told as follows:

'We find in the NT traces of Aramaic readings of Heb. verses in books like the Psalms (reference made to Mt 27<sup>46</sup>, cf. Ps 22<sup>2</sup>; Eph 4<sup>8</sup>, cf. Ps 68<sup>19</sup>). The agreement of these with readings still found in Targums, which we know were not reduced to their present form until long after, cannot be purely accidental.'

The writer suggests that our Lord used the Targum of Ps 22 upon the Cross (*Sabachthani*) or a nearly coincident text; and that St. Paul with his 'gave gifts to men' against the Hebrew and the Septuagint is suspiciously under Targum influences. Surely this raises a wider question than the explanation of a couple of curious textual agreements: if there is Targum in the N.T. we ought to find it in dogmatic expression as well as in textual coincidence. Let us see whether anything can be said under this head.

The Christian Church from the time of the first formulation of its Creed had for one of its articles the statement that

'He ascended into heaven'

and

'Sitteth at the right hand of God.'

Now, however ancient the Creed itself may be, this statement cannot be primitive, even if we should point to its occurrence in the N.T. itself. It could not have been formulated in a Christianized synagogue, for the 'right hand of God' is a tabooed term. 'Right hand' implies 'left hand' and other organs and dimensions. We know the trouble that there is in our own day, when people

think only occasionally about God and religion, to make the language of the Creeds intelligible; how many-fold more was it difficult when the community was always thinking on the themes in question, and fortifying itself at every point against human terms for the definition or action of Deity. The question before us is peculiarly interesting; for the Christians either deduced the Session at the Right Hand, or proved it, when otherwise inferred, by the first verses of Ps 110. When we take the language back into the Psalm, both the Christian and the Jew are up against the same taboo in language: we must not say

'Sit at my right hand, until I make,' etc.

First, let the Jew explain to us the speech of Jahveh. One method of the Jewish interpreter of the Psalm is to leave the sentence out, and substitute a statement that the Lord promised to give David the victory over Saul. Another explanation is that the Lord said by His Word that He would give me (David) the dominion because I had devoted myself to the *Law of His right hand*. This is very ingenious; by importing from the Pentateuch the fiery law of God's right hand, and making David sit at the study of that law, the right hand becomes impersonal and non-local, and the problem is solved. Even the speech of God, 'The Lord said to my Lord,' is got rid of by an ordinary Targum periphrasis, that what God does, He does by His Word. There is no doubt that the passage furnished perplexity in Targumizing circles. But do we find anything similar in the N.T.? The answer is in the affirmative. For instance, the writer to the Hebrews has three references to the Session at the Right Hand, all of which probably go back to the Psalm which he definitely quotes: in two of the cases he writes, not the right hand of God, but

'The right hand of the Majesty' (He 1<sup>o</sup>).

'The right hand of the throne of the Majesty' (He 8<sup>1</sup>).

These are pure Targumisms, such as occur constantly in the Targum on O.T., where mention is made of God's hands, organs, or dimensions. Here is another Targumic substitute closely allied to the foregoing: when Jesus is brought before the high priest and adjured to declare Himself, He tells His judges that they will see 'the Son of man sitting at the right hand of the Power, and coming

on the clouds of heaven.' This is a composite quotation, part of it from the 110th Psalm and part from the seventh chapter of Daniel; The thing to notice is that the expression 'the right hand of God' has been replaced by the 'right hand of the Power.' This is, again, a substitution after the manner of the Targum: and the Synoptic tradition reports our Lord as using Targumic language, which would not lose its meaning for its judges because of the caution of its expression.

Our next example is in the twelfth chapter of John, where, at the close of a strong anti-Judaic statement, a quotation is made from the sixth chapter of Isaiah, about the blinding of the eyes of the unbelieving and the hardening of their hearts, upon which the evangelist remarks:

'Isaiah said these things *when he saw his glory*, and he spake of him.'

The reference is of course to the opening verses of the chapter, where Isaiah affirms that he has seen the Lord, exalted on His lofty throne. It is well known that this statement caused much heart-searching to interpreters; in the Ascension of Isaiah, the Apocryphal writer makes this statement of the prophet the ground of his martyrdom. He was, in fact, put to death for blasphemy. The Fourth Gospel has his own explanation:

'He saw *the glory of God*';

and this is the well-known Targum substitution, in cases where an explanation of a hard text is required. Let us see how the actual Targum on Isaiah will get over the difficulty: he says,

'I saw *the glory of God* resting on a lofty throne,' etc.;

but this is precisely the language of the Fourth Gospel, which must therefore be held to Targumize.

This is a peculiarly interesting example because, as I have shown elsewhere, the Gospel is at this point drawing upon a primitive book of *Testimonies*, and the Targumism which we have detected is much older than the Fourth Gospel.

This substitution of the 'Glory' or 'Splendour' for the name of God occurs in places where the Divine Presence would be expressed with too strong a sense of locality. A strict Targumist would not talk of the Face of God; he might, however, speak of the Presence of the Glory. It



is interesting to see that there are traces of this expression in the N.T.

Here is a curious group of passages which have some sort of interrelation. In Eph 1<sup>4</sup> we are told that God chose us who are believers in Christ before the foundation of the world, with a view to our being 'holy and blameless before him':

ἀγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ.

The parallel passage in Colossians is 1<sup>22</sup>, where we are told that Christ is to present us 'holy and blameless and unapproachable before him':

παραστήσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλή-  
τους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ.

One of these passages is, no doubt, the source of the other.

Now turn to the doxology at the end of Jude's Epistle: we find that God is spoken of as 'able to make us stand before his glory blameless with exceeding joy':

καὶ στήσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους ἐν  
ἁγαλλιάσει.

We are now struck with the parallelism of the language in Jude and that in Colossians; the sentiments are almost equivalent, the terms in which expression is made almost the same: we especially note the use of a preposition κατενώπιον which occurs nowhere else in the N.T. and only rarely in the LXX. There is, then, some connexion between the passages quoted.

We notice, then, in the next place, that where Colossians says 'before him,' the Epistle of Jude says 'before his glory.' This is a Targumism, and must be added to those that we have already detected: the writer did not wish to speak of being presented before God or before the Face of God, so he made a conventional synagogue modification.

We may find another similar Targumism in a parallel passage in the Apocalypse. In c. 14<sup>4, 5</sup>, we are told of the first-fruits of a redeemed humanity, gathered to God and the Lamb, and who are without falsehood; it is said of them that they are 'without blame *before the throne of God*':

ἄμωμοί εἰσιν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Modern editors of the Greek text have reduced this sentence to an unrelated, disjointed ἄμωμοί εἰσιν, and they certainly have every MS. of any weight on their side. For all that, it is extremely unlikely that this can be the right text; the parallels show that the missing five words are necessary. They cannot have been added from Jude or Ephesians. We therefore restore them provisionally and remark that we have here another Targumism for 'before God' or 'before the face of God': this time it is 'before the throne of God,' which meets the Targumist's difficulty very satisfactorily.

We can hardly detach from the foregoing cases the parallel which is furnished by the thirteenth Ode of Solomon (the Mirror Ode), which ends up with an injunction to be without blame (= ἄμωμοι) at all times *before Him*. The Ode helps us again to see that the printed text of the Apocalypse is at fault. It also shows that there is some common religious formula in circulation, which all the writers quoted have been working upon.

Perhaps it is Gn 17<sup>1</sup>, 'Walk *before me*, and *be thou perfect*,' where the Syriac has the equivalent of ἄμωμος.

It is evident, then, that the time is ripe for a renewed critical study of the Targums, both from the point of view of textual criticism and from the standpoint of the higher criticism, and in particular further investigation is required into the reaction of the Targums on the New Testament.

## Contributions and Comments.

### Paul at Athens.

Two things about Paul's visit at Athens (Ac 17) seem to have become commonplaces with recent writers: (1) That Paul was disappointed at the results; (2) that in the First Epistle to the Corinthians he acknowledges his mistake in

preaching at Athens as he did (1 Co 1<sup>18-25</sup>, specially 2<sup>2</sup>). The article on Paul by Dr. G. G. Findlay, in *Hastings' Bible Dictionary*, says that Paul's sermon 'made no decided impression on this audience.' Ramsay, in *St. Paul the Traveller*, says that 'Paul was disappointed and perhaps disillusioned by his experience in Athens,' and so

he goes on to show by his preaching in Corinth that he did not again attempt to present his message in 'the terms of current philosophy.' It is sufficient to quote these two.

Is there sufficient warrant for either of these statements in the record? Let us reproduce the setting at Athens, including the audience, and then ask if Paul could have spoken otherwise with any hope of winning his hearers? Does not the sermon illustrate his own words, 'I am become all things to all men, that I may by all means save some'? How could he speak to the gathering 'in the midst of the Areopagus' as he did to the people who answered to the description given in 1 Co 6<sup>9-11</sup>?

Then, was the sermon a failure judged by the results? He only preached there once, and was interrupted before he finished. 'But certain clave unto him, and believed: among whom also was Dionysius the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and others with them.' At the least this cannot mean less than six, probably more. What modern missionary standing before a strange and hostile audience, and permitted to deliver only a part of his sermon, would not consider that he had won a great victory if he found that six or more of his hearers 'believed' and accepted his new and strange doctrine?

Further, what evidence is there of any connexion between the sermon at Athens and the passage referred to in the Epistle? Is there not just as much reason for saying, that is none at all, that if Paul had not been in quite so much of a hurry to get away from Athens he might have gathered together quite a strong Church there?

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

*Theological Seminary,  
Auburn, N. Y.*

## Isaiah xlv. 5 in the Light of the Elephantine Papyri.

AMONG the papyri edited by Sayce and Cowley<sup>1</sup> there is one (lettered K) which contains an allusion, to the best of the present writer's knowledge, still unexplained. The document in question, which is dated B.C. 410, is an assignment of slaves. Two men—Mahseiah ben Nathan and

Yedoniah ben Nathan by name—agree to divide the two slaves which belonged to their deceased mother Mibtahiah. The agreement as translated by Dr. Cowley<sup>2</sup> runs:

'We have agreed together and have divided between us the slaves of Mibtahiah our mother. And note this is the share which comes to you as a share—you Yedoniah—Petosiri by name, whose mother is Tebo a slave. A yod is marked on his arm at the right of a marking in the Aramaic language, thus Mibtahiah's. Note also this is the share which comes to me as a share—me Mahseiah—Belo by name, whose mother is Tebo a slave. A yod is marked on his arm at the right of a marking in the Aramaic language, thus Mibtahiah's.'

The Aramaic of the passage to which attention is drawn runs: יוד שנית על ידה בימן שניתה מקרא למבטחיה ארמית כונה למבטחיה in both cases.

The meaning of the marking 'Mibtahiah's' is obvious. We know that the practice of branding or marking slaves to establish the right of ownership is at least four thousand years old. It is mentioned in the Code of Hammurabi. But what is the meaning of the mark yod? Two explanations are possible. It is unfortunate that the meaning of the verb שנת used here is not altogether certain; but it is likely that branding or tattooing is meant. In Jastrow's Dictionary the meaning of the word is said to be 'teeth-like marks.' The suggested connexion with שן, a tooth, is probably not intended to be a philological one. The examples of the word there given refer to marks on measures or vessels.

Now in the Law Israelites were strictly forbidden to tattoo or mark their flesh. In Lv 19<sup>28</sup> we read 'ye shall not make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead nor print any marks upon you.' In Old Testament times there appear to have been at least three different significations attached to cutting or marking the flesh, viz. (a) mourning (Lv 19<sup>28</sup>); (b) worship as in an ecstatic frenzy (1 K 18<sup>28</sup>); and (c) consecration.

With the first two we are not here concerned. Marking the flesh by branding or tattooing was not uncommon in antiquity. The name or symbol of the deity marked upon the body de-

<sup>2</sup> *Jewish Documents of the Time of Ezra.* S.P.C.K., London, 1919, p. 70, footnote. 'Yod, i.e. the Aramaic letter Y. The meaning of the mark is obscure. All the slaves have Egyptian names.'

<sup>1</sup> *Aramaic Papyri discovered at Assuan.* London, 1906.



noted consecration to his service and the placing of oneself beneath his protection. An example from Lower Egypt is given us by Herodotus 2. 113. 'ἦν δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς ἡύονος τὸ καὶ νῦν ἐστὶ Ἡρακλέος ἱερόν ἐς τὸ ἦν καταφυγῶν οἰκέτης ὁ τευδῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιβάλληται στίγματα ἱερά ἐωντὸν διδοὺς τῷ θεῷ οὐκ ἔξεστι τούτου ἀψασθαι. ὁ νόμος οὗτος διατελεῖ ἕων ὁμοίους τὸ μέχρι ἐμέο ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. The statement that the custom prevailed in his own day is instructive.<sup>1</sup> The words of 1 K 20<sup>41</sup>, 'And he took the headband away from his eyes; and the king of Israel discerned him that he was of the prophets,' imply that a mark of some kind was borne on the forehead of the prophets themselves in the time of Ahab. Again, in 3 Mac 2<sup>29</sup>, there is an account of an attempt to brand on the bodies of the Jews of Alexandria the emblem of Dionysus. Allusions to the practice of sealing or marking the foreheads or hands of individuals under the protection of the deity occur in Ezk 9<sup>4</sup> and the well-known passages in Gal 6<sup>17</sup>, Rev 7<sup>3f</sup>, 13<sup>16f</sup>, 20<sup>4</sup>. But by far the most interesting passage from the point of view of the present inquiry is Is 44<sup>5</sup>, which reads, 'One will say I am Yahweh's . . . another will write on his hand To Yahweh.'

#### וה יכתב ידו ליהוה

This verse is most reasonably interpreted as meaning that Gentile converts to Israel's religion will publicly swear allegiance to Yahweh, and mark indelibly on their persons an outward and visible sign of their allegiance to him. But whatever interpretation we give the verse the meaning of the words themselves is plain. The practice referred to is that attested for Lower Egypt by Herodotus in the fifth century B.C.—some thirty or forty years before this particular document was drawn up in Elephantine—that of marking on one's person the name or symbol of the god to whom one dedicates oneself. Though this last passage refers to a practice of the Gentiles, the words at the end of the regulations for the keeping of Mazzoth in Ex 13<sup>9</sup>, 'it shall be for a sign unto thee upon thine hand,' seem to imply that there was a strong desire among the Hebrews themselves to adopt this heathen rite, a desire which the inspired writer seeks to sublimate.

The question now arises, Could the yod stand for Yahweh? I am inclined to think it may. The

<sup>1</sup> To this day, it is said, the Copts in Egypt have a cross tattooed on wrist or arm.

owners of these slaves appear to have belonged to the more pious members of the community at Elephantine; their names probably occurred in the list of those who subscribed to the temple funds. It might be urged against this view that as the two slaves marked by the yod bear Egyptian names (in one case a heathen theophorous name) it is unlikely that they would have devoted themselves to the service of Yahweh. On the other hand, nothing is more probable than that slaves would adopt the religion of their masters. The evidence of Gn 17<sup>12, 18</sup>—the more relevant because it comes from the source P—is that slaves were circumcised so that they might join in the family worship. Indeed, so common was the custom in post-exilic times that in the very early Midrash Mechilta (on Ex 12<sup>44</sup>) the question is gravely discussed whether a Jew can continue to hold a slave who refuses to embrace Judaism.<sup>2</sup> In the case of the slaves in question there would be the more reason that they who bore heathen names should adopt a visible sign of their conversion to Judaism, than those whose names and conversation had proclaimed from birth what they were.

In the nature of things the theory is not susceptible of proof, though several convergent considerations suggest its probability. There are the contemporary testimony of Herodotus to the prevalence of the practice in Lower Egypt; the consideration that common prudence would suggest to a garrison surrounded by hostile communions the necessity of excluding heathen dependants from their houses; and the prophecy of the Deutero-Isaiah.

Finally, there is a simple if less interesting explanation of the meaning of the sign yod. It is expressly pointed out that it is marked on the slaves' hands (יד) at the right of the mark למבטחיה. This rather suggests that the legend למבטחיה was there first, and that the yods were added afterwards; or, at all events, were meant to be read *before* the statement 'Mibtahiah's.'

If this be the case it may be that the yods stand for ירה, 'inheritor' (a word found elsewhere in these papyri). And so the whole expression means 'belonging to the heir of Mibtahiah.' If the practice of branding slaves was general and neces-

<sup>2</sup> In later times special regulations were framed to cover the numerous cases of Gentile slaves refusing to become Jews. Cf. Winter, *Die Stellung der Sklaven bei den Juden*. Breslau, 1886.

sary it would obviously be a much more convenient way of marking a change of ownership than to cancel the old marks and brand fresh ones in possibly a less conspicuous position. A device similar in its object is familiar in our own day, namely, that of writing the words 'executors of' before the name of the original and deceased owner of property.

ALFRED GUILLAUME.

*Durham.*

## The Disciple whom Jesus loved.

CAN he be identified? It seems to be generally agreed that this is no mere ideal figure but a real person. Dr. Moffatt (*Introd. to N.T.*, pp. 566-7) says that 'the choice lies between John the Apostle or John the Jerusalemite (Delfi, Bousset, etc.), and regarding him as an ideal. The chief objections to this latter view are the psychological difficulty of conceiving how an abstract figure could be put side by side with the other disciples, and the fact that in the Jerusalem scenes Delfi's hypothesis has considerable plausibility.' Of this John the Jerusalemite we know nothing. He is a conjectural figure brought in presumably to fit in with the Jerusalem scenes. The difficulties in identifying this disciple with John the Apostle are obvious.

First of all this disciple is in the secrets of Jesus as the others are not (Jn 13<sup>22, 24</sup> R.V.). Peter appeals to him to reveal the name of the one who should betray the Master. We have no reason to think that John the son of Zebedee would obtain possession of a secret not open also to Peter. The Synoptic picture with the Samaritan incident (Lk 9<sup>51f.</sup>) and the request of the mother for the first place in the Kingdom for her sons (Mt 20<sup>20f.</sup>) do not provide an atmosphere where secrets are either told or discovered. As far as we know the Apostle John, at that time he was no more able to enter into the mind of Jesus than the others.

Then this disciple is known to the High Priest (Jn 18<sup>15</sup>). Again this cannot apply to John the Apostle. Why should he have this acquaintance-ship which Peter has not? They are both Galileans, both from the same village, both in the same business. They have turned in the

same circles, belong to the same social class, and would have the same friends.

It is this disciple who takes Mary 'to his own home from that very hour' (Jn 19<sup>26</sup>). Obviously it must be near to Jerusalem. Hence the introduction of the other John, the Jerusalemite. One cannot but think that this disciple is entrusted with the care of Mary because of certain special qualifications. 'Behold thy mother' would not be spoken to one who had not revealed some very exceptional qualities.

The other two references are Jn 20<sup>2f.</sup> and Jn 21<sup>7f.</sup> The last is very significant. It has been explained on the ground of the long life of the Apostle John, although the tradition of an early death of the Apostle cannot be easily set aside.

Are those the only two possible names? Is there one who can fill the picture more adequately?

The phrase, 'The disciple whom Jesus loved' (ὁ ἀγαπᾶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς), does not occur till we come to the 13th chapter, and then is found several times to the end of the Gospel. Some one has come into the story who carries the title. Either he was not in the story before, or he has received a new name. But a similar phrase is found in chap. 11, 'He whom thou lovest is sick,' *Κὶ ἰε, ἴδε ὃν φιλεῖς ἀσθενεῖ*. No name is mentioned, no name is needed. Jesus recognizes the reference to Lazarus, who evidently is known as the one who is loved by Jesus. This is the word used of the household at Bethany, but used of none other. Jn 11<sup>5</sup>, *Ἠγάπα δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν Μάρθαν καὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῆς καὶ τὸν Δάζαρον*. It is true that in the first intimation concerning Lazarus the word used is *φιλεῖς*, but this is the word also used in chap. 20<sup>2</sup> about this 'other disciple.' The two words are evidently used interchangeably. If we were reading without any previous notions and had marked the passage in chap. 11<sup>5</sup>, 'and Jesus loved Martha . . . and Lazarus,' and then had come across the phrase in chap. 13, 'The disciple whom Jesus loved,' we should, I think, immediately connect the two. *It is Lazarus who has come into the story.* Can he fill the picture?

1. He is one who lives in the atmosphere of 'understanding.' The incident of the breaking of the ointment (Jn 12<sup>1f.</sup>), when Mary seems to have an intuition the others present had not, some sensitiveness of the approaching end, gives us a setting entirely favourable. Lazarus, a member of that household, if any one, would have been



allowed to know the mind of Jesus about the betrayer and the betrayal.

2. He lives near Jerusalem, and so could have the acquaintance of the High Priest. His home is the one where Jesus is received, and there Mary the Mother would also be welcomed. What more likely home for her than the one where Jesus had such close and near friends?

3. He looks into the tomb and 'believes'—is persuaded. There is a suggestion that this comes to him in a way as it did not come to the others. Dr. Moffatt says: 'He is the first to see the empty tomb and then believe, *i.e.* without requiring to see the risen Christ. The empty tomb was enough for him. All else, Old Testament proofs, and even the witness of the women was secondary.' And since the story is that Lazarus himself had been dead, and had been raised from the dead, well might he be 'persuaded.'

4. Of him it is said that he would not see death. This is just what we should expect, namely, that Lazarus who had been raised should not again have to face death. It is into this home that Peter comes after his denial; a home warm with hospitality, where he knew would be those who would understand.

Two objections immediately arise: (1) Would Lazarus have been at the table on that last night, the Betrayal night? Any objections against Lazarus will weigh equally well against John the Jerusalemite. But we must remember that each evening that week Jesus had returned to Bethany to the house of Lazarus. The last silent day had been spent under that hospitable roof, and it is not inconceivable that on that last journey He took Lazarus with Him, as He had probably taken him on the previous days. We know that Lazarus was by this time also suspect, and that intrigues were being made against him also because of the story of his rising from the dead. He is in the same danger as Jesus, a danger not shared by the Apostles. He was running risks because of his friendship with Jesus—peculiar risks not shared by the others. From chap. 12 onward, the raising of Lazarus, if it does not dominate the course of the events, at least is a large factor in the determination of them. To a large extent Jesus and Lazarus go together in these last chapters of John.

There is also this word said of Lazarus, 'He was also one of them that sat at the table with

him' (Jn 12<sup>2</sup>). The phrase is introduced by the word 'But,' at least suggesting some departure out of the ordinary course. Here is a prominence that must mean more than the desire to find some mention of all three in that household. Dr. Marcus Dods (*Expositor's Greek Testament*, in loco) notes this saying with these words, 'He is mentioned not to show that Lazarus was still alive and well, but because the Feast was in the house of Simon the Leper.' May it not have been, however, that Lazarus is mentioned because he has become an intimate of Jesus, as one who sits at the same table with Him? If so, it would not be strange if at the last feast this one, so specially marked out, were present. In fact, his absence would have been remarkable.

There is the other phrase, 'the other disciple,' identified with the disciple whom Jesus loved, in Jn 20<sup>2</sup>. It cannot be John the Apostle, for in chap. 21 the son of Zebedee has already been mentioned in v.<sup>1</sup> with the additional words, 'And two other of his disciples.' It is one of these two who says, 'It is the Lord.' The phrase 'the other disciple' seems to be without parallel, but the suggestion conveyed is 'an extra disciple,' not one called in the ordinary way, not of 'The Twelve,' the name by which the Apostles are known in this Gospel. The uniqueness here is not of one who has come to pre-eminence *inter pares*, but rather of one who has been introduced into the company.

The other objection arises from the closing words of the last chapter, especially v.<sup>24</sup>, which seems to identify the 'other disciple' with the evangelist. Apart from all critical reasons against identifying the writer with John the Apostle it can very well be that the verse only applies to this last chapter as an epilogue. In fact, the words convey the idea that this source is different from the others. In Jn 19<sup>35</sup> is found the same form of words, as if these two testimonies which came from 'the other disciple' called for special mention. This would not be required unless there was some difference to be noted either in the source of the testimony or in the testimony itself. In his article 'Lazarus' in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, Dr. David Smith says: 'It might be expected that Lazarus of all men should have stood by Jesus during the last dread ordeal, but he never appears after the banquet

in Simon's house. His name is nowhere mentioned in the story of the Lord's Passion. What is the explanation? Enraged by the impression which the miracle made, and the support it brought to Jesus, the High Priests plotted the death of Lazarus (Jn 10<sup>12, 11</sup>), and it is probable that ere the final crisis he had been compelled to withdraw from the vicinity of Jerusalem.' If the above conjecture be correct, that stigma is removed

from the character of Lazarus. He did not leave Jesus, he did not forsake Him. He was with Him to the end, with Him at the trial, with Him at the Cross, and was early at the tomb. It is to his house that Mary goes, to his house that Peter, having denied his Lord, returns to be 'healed of his wounds,' and to be preserved for the Church and the Kingdom.

B. GREY GRIFFITH.

## Entre Nous.

### SOME TOPICS.

#### New Words.

'If we wish to understand the spirit of the earliest Christian community at the time when the gospel message was still fresh from the lips of our Lord Himself and His apostles, we cannot do better than consider the new phraseology which appeared at their time. Men do not coin new words to express old ideas. A new religious dialect is the index of a new revelation. Of these new words, or old words re-minted with quite a new stamp, the most remarkable are the Greek nouns we translate love, humility, faith, and joy.

'The word for love is practically a new word. The new commandment needed a new and unspoilt name. The old wine-skins might have spoilt the taste of the new wine. The word for humility was old; the Church, however, stamped it with the Cross and changed it from a vice into a virtue. Faith and hope, too, were raised for the first time to moral virtues, and the content of both words was immeasurably enriched. The same is true of the word peace. Last, but not least, it is true of the word joy. Love, joy, peace, faith, hope, humility—these are characteristic Christian ideas. Whenever these words threaten to drop out of our vocabulary, or are used with an unrealised suspicion of unreality, cant or affectation, then we may be sure that we are losing the ethics of the Christian spirit, and are falling back into paganism. It is an absolutely sure and scientific test. If we do not want the words which Christianity has had to coin to express its new ideas, the reason must be that we have lost the ideas themselves.'

The speaker is Dean Inge. The quotation is made from a sermon preached in St. Paul's and reported in the 98th volume of *The Christian World Pulpit* (James Clarke; 7s. 6d. net). The volume is more representative than usual. Only two men are reported as often as five times—Dr. Horton and Dean Inge.

#### Newman's Style.

We have found great delight in a volume of essays by J. M. E. Crees, D.Lit., Headmaster of the Cathedral Grammar School, Hereford. It is a volume to be taken up with expectation, so broad is the page and so beautiful the paper—as much a rarity as Christian charity in these grey days. Much of it is occupied with Meredith, hence the title *Meredith Revisited, and other Essays* (Cobden-Sanderson; 12s. 6d. net). But the essays in which we have found most pleasure are those on the Greek and Latin classics—the essay on the *Odyssey*, the essay on *Verres*, the essay on two of the plays of *Aristophanes*; and most of all, even quite exquisitely, the essay on the *Medea*. How Keats (of whom we are all thinking at present) would have thrilled with joy in their ancient atmosphere.

There is an essay on 'An Eminent Victorian.' It is John Henry Newman. And that essay is chiefly on Newman's English style. Dr. Crees says: 'It is hard to characterise perfection, and it is difficult adequately to express one's admiration for Newman's style. Yet even a man so different as Henley, the apostle of the robust, felt its magic. Newman does not play the virtuoso like de Quincey, who swaggers up to the conductor's desk, and with



a *tumultuoso* as he raises his baton, tells us what tune the orchestra will play. Of style for style's own sake Newman thought nothing, yet so certain is his touch that he can adapt himself with unfailing ease to all the exigencies of his subject. No master knows better how to achieve the perfect synthesis of thought and expression; his noblest passages seem the final and perfect rendering of the idea that he has bodied forth in a consummate interfusion of intellect and emotion. The divine afflatus had been breathed upon *him* too, and none has more closely reproduced in words the actual glow of inspiration, or explained with clearer understanding a great writer's lavish fulness of phrase. "He is master of the two-fold Logos, the thought and the word, distinct, but inseparable from each other. He may, if so be, elaborate his composition or he may pour out his improvisations, but in either case he has but one aim, which he keeps steadily before him, and is conscientious and single-minded in fulfilling. That aim is to give forth what he has within him; and from his very earnestness it comes to pass that, whatever be the splendour of his diction or the harmony of his periods, he has with him the charm of an uncommunicable simplicity. He writes passionately, because he feels keenly; forcibly, because he conceives vividly; he sees too clearly to be vague; he is too serious to be otiose; he can analyse his subject, and therefore he is rich; he embraces it as a whole and in its parts, and therefore he is consistent; he has a firm hold of it, and therefore he is luminous. When his imagination swells up, it overflows in ornament; when his heart is touched, it thrills along his verse. He always has the right word for the right idea, and never a word too much."

#### A TEXT.

##### Jude 3.

When Bishop Charles Gore answered Dr. Headlam's Bampton Lectures on the Early Ministry he addressed his answer, in an open letter, to the Bishop of Nassau. Why to him? Those who have come upon the sermon which the Bishop of Nassau preached at the Anniversary of the English Church Union last year will understand. The sermon was quoted in *The Church Times* for June 25.

The Bishop of Nassau was present at the Lambeth Conference. On that occasion the

*Church Times* said: 'The Right Rev. Roscow Shedden, D.D., is one of the youngest bishops in the Anglican communion, being still under forty years of age. Educated at Winchester and at New College, Oxford, he was for ten years curate of All Saints', Margaret-street, and was consecrated Bishop of Nassau on St. John Baptist Day last year. Gifted both physically and intellectually above the common, he has already made a great mark in his island diocese, and, notwithstanding his youth, he will probably be listened to with attention and respect at the Lambeth Conference. He combines force and clearness in the presentation of his own ideas, together with a capacity for sympathy with and understanding his opponents. Lately he has made a thorough study of all the problems of Home Reunion, both as they affect the Church of England and the American Church.'

The text which Dr. Shedden chose for the anniversary sermon was the third verse of the Epistle of Jude: 'The faith which was once delivered unto the saints.' He began far enough away to arouse curiosity. 'A characteristic feature of many early codes of law was the right of sanctuary. An institution deriving both from Mosaic and pagan forces, it became widely popularized under mediæval Christianity. The value of the right of sanctuary belonged to days anterior to the recognition of the majesty of law; it secured men against the injustices of short shrift and lynch-law; it was intended to afford a shelter for the innocent, the weak, and the misunderstood, in order that they might have a breathing space and a reprieve, during which the blind passion of the pursuer might perhaps spend its force. Sanctuary was not designed to offer a means of final escape, but to be a temporary expedient for staying execution; often if the fugitive refused to quit his sanctuary he would have to risk dying of starvation. Sooner or later he was compelled either to vanish, or, as we say nowadays, "to face the music."'

Then he came to his text: 'One cannot help becoming conscious of a widely-spread tendency amongst our friends to treat certain texts of Holy Scripture as sanctuary against the adversary, and there are few texts which are harder worked in this respect than the one which I have chosen this morning. I know many people really think that to shelter themselves in any controversy behind this sonorous phrase—"The faith once



delivered unto the saints"—is the end of the whole matter.

'But sanctuaries were not always of equal value. The fugitive from Westminster, charged with some crime, who took refuge in the City beyond Temple Bar had a large and roomy sanctuary where he could maintain resistance for any length of time; but the fugitive who rushed for shelter to some little wayside shrine could not hope to hold out for many days. Similarly, these sheltering texts, to which we are inclined to run for sanctuary, will sometimes afford us the security of a city, sometimes only that of a wayside shrine; sometimes it would be folly to disregard them, sometimes it would be wiser to pass them by. But in either case, when the pursuer is at our heels they ought never to be regarded as more than a temporary resting-place. We may choose our time, but a time we must choose, to come out into the open and face our adversaries; the breathing-space must be used to equip ourselves for the fight.

'Now this is where I believe the Catholic party generally is failing. Useful as sanctuaries may frequently have been in history, there were times when it would have been well for the social life of England if they had been wholly abolished. I am not certain that it would not be a great benefit to the Catholic Revival if we all agreed for the next ten years at least to put ourselves under a self-denying ordinance against the use of this particular text. I should desire this, not because it disconcerts and irritates our opponents, but because so long as we cling to its shelter we are as much the prisoners of a blockade as was the German High Seas Fleet behind the lock-gates of the Kiel Canal. It is true that our adversaries cannot touch us, but neither can we touch them: the world of religious thought goes on without us, and sooner or later we shall die of inanition.

'Probably it will be sooner, because in the vast majority of cases the sanctuary proves to be very narrow and very inadequate. For what most people mean when they appeal to "the faith once delivered to the saints," is simply what they conceive that once-delivered faith to have been, and any suggestion that their conception should be submitted to the tests of modern scholarship and research is resented as disloyalty to the faith. So the meaning of "the faith once delivered to the saints" comes actually to be "the faith as interpreted by myself and my friends." But it is

precisely this latter which is the object of challenge, and by assuming the complete identification of the two we are begging the question and evading the real issue.

'I am sure that if we are really to advance our cause we have to bring our case out into the open, to meet our adversaries on their own ground, to try to answer their arguments. We have got a small handful of really strong apologists, but I am afraid that it is not very many Catholic clergymen who are willing to leave the shelter of their intellectual sanctuary. I know that their lives are so occupied, and so well occupied, that they have little time for reading or thought, but we cannot be altogether surprised that our influence upon the thinking world is so very slight.

'I wish we could all realize the importance of at least making a serious effort to understand what the opinions of our opponents really are and why they hold them. The same thing is quite as true of them in regard to us, and we might give them a useful lead. But unless we are to go on with the rather unsatisfying and unprofitable task of knocking down men of straw, we must read what we can of one another's books and try to give the fullest weight to their arguments. We may all occasionally learn something which we did not know before and which happens to be true.

'If we are to continue as a living force we must be eager to keep abreast of every movement in the thought of our age. It is not sufficient to shelter behind what Dr. Liddon said, or what Dr. Pusey would have said, or our own interpretation of this overworked text of St. Jude. Besides following the beaten track of theologians belonging to our own school of thought, we have got to make excursions into the difficult country where Mr. Streeter and Dean Inge and Dr. Headlam would take us. Without some effort on our part to estimate fairly the value of their evidence and the cogency of their arguments, we cannot hope to find the right line on which they may be met and perhaps refuted. In the most important question which is before the Church of England to-day, our relations with Separatist bodies, we shall do our own cause infinite harm if it becomes apparent that our *non possumus* attitude springs not out of learning and principle but out of ignorance and prejudice.

'In our affection for Tradition, let us not be afraid of Truth.'



## NEW POETRY.

Helen Gray Cone.

The fame of Helen Gray Cone is great in her own American land. It is not less in this land of ours; for she is the author of the 'Chant of Love for England.' The new volume will increase her reputation in both countries. It is a collection of three series: 'Sonnets of the Great Peace,' 'Moods of War,' and 'The Quiet Days.' The title is taken from the first poem, a striking allegory—*The Coat without a Seam* (Dent; 4s. 6d. net). There are poems in the book which will hold their own with any that the war has given us yet. There is especially a fine recognition of the soldier who died before he had the opportunity of striking a blow:

Hang his bright arms undinted on the wall.

In all brave colours whereto his dreams  
aspired

Blazon his blank shield as his heart desired,  
And write above: '*The readiness is all.*'

And there is this:

## THE IMPERATIVE.

Whether we lose the light  
Of love or of the sun,  
With body and blood and mind and might  
Must this sole thing be done:

The world is a broken ball,  
Stained red because it fell  
Out of bounds, in a game of kings,  
Over the wall of hell:

And now must the spirit of man  
Arise and adventure all—  
Leap the wall sheer down into hell  
And bring up the broken ball.

Worth well, to lose the light  
Of love or of the sun,  
Worth endless fire or endless night,  
So this sole thing were done!

Austin Clarke.

Mr. Austin Clarke is an Irish poet whose advent with 'The Vengeance of Fionn' was hailed enthusiastically by AE and other good poets and discerners of good poetry. His new volume is a blank verse epic, its theme the death of Moses. He represents Moses, as a prophet, foreseeing the things that were to come to pass in after ages, as he gazed upon that goodly land he was not allowed to enter. Among the rest he foresees the conflict with Baal. Hence the title *The Fires of Baäl* (Maunsel & Roberts; 3s. 6d. net). This description of what met the eye of the patriarch immediately will give some idea of Mr. Clarke's manner:

Anguished, he gazed

Across the measureless plains where they  
recede

Like calm blue seas into the gentle hills  
Of Gilead, the purple fading verge  
Of the blue sky; for there are little valleys  
Odorous with balsam boughs and fair  
As the rugged ravines beneath the lonely  
pines,

And wild Caucassian cliffs of star-blue ice,  
Where the cliffs of rhododendron seem  
For ever sunset—milder those and sweet  
With olive waters and the silver chime  
Of anklets, while the Gentile maidens dance  
Rosily through the almond-blossom trees  
By starlight, to the lutes of sombre lemans,  
Or sadly chant among hushed nightingales  
Strange lullabies their mothers sleepily crooned  
In ancient tongues of mighty Tubal Cain,  
Him that first wrought in smelted iron, brass  
And golden ore, and of his mightier brother,  
Jubal; he first had strung the ivoried harp  
And wandered, musical, by the flaming walls  
Of Paradise at eveningtide.

---

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,  
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,  
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.